DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 021 CE 017 413

AUTHOR Aller, Curtis C.; And Others
TITLE Layoff Time Training: A Key to Upgrading Workforce Utilization and EEOC Affirmative Action. A Case Study in the Northern California Canning Industry. R & D Monograph 61.
INSTITUTION Center for Applied Manpower Research, Berkeley, Calif.; Joint Committee for Cannery Training Program, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 78
CONTRACT 21-06-74-12
GRANT 21-06-74-06
NOTE 123p.; Parts of some pages in this document may not reproduce well due to poor print quality
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock Number 029-000-00326-2)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Basic Education; *Affirmative Action; Demonstration Projects; Employee Attitudes; Employer Employee Relationship; Employment Practices; Employment Problems; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Failure Factors; Federal Court Litigation; *Food Processing Occupations; Industrial Relations; *Industrial Training; *Job Layoff; Labor Market; Labor Unions; *Manpower Utilization; On the Job Training; Personnel Policy; Promotion (Occupational); Racial Discrimination; Sex Discrimination; Success Factors; Work Attitudes; Working Women
IDENTIFIERS *California; *Canning Industry

ABSTRACT

An experimental and demonstration project was conducted over a five-year period in California to test the concept of lay-off time training to enable workers to qualify for promotion and increase their earnings. The canning industry was found to be a suitable area for this type of training since it had annual lay-offs followed by assured recalls to work and was feeling affirmative action pressures. The project's final efforts (after two years of discouraging experiences) in the canning industry were quite successful and included the following benefits: (1) extensive changes in the knowledge and attitudes of working women toward advancement and employment; (2) the job status of women improved; (3) both the companies and the union learned about the operation of their labor market; (4) the affirmative action process was accelerated; (5) the industry developed internal training programs; and (6) the public schools developed adult basic education for the cannery workers. Also, the project's training program was included in a U.S. Court approved Equal Employment Opportunity agreement for the industry. (ELG)

ED158021

Layoff Time Training: A Key to Upgrading Workforce Utilization and EEOC Affirmative Action

A Case Study in the Northern California Canning Industry

R & D Monograph 61

U.S. Department of Labor
Ray Marshall, Secretary

Employment and Training Administration
Ernest G. Green
Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training
1978

This report was prepared by Curtis C. Aller, Donald Mayall, John Mitchell, and David C. Roberts for the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under Grant No. 21-06-74-06 to the Center for Applied Manpower Research and Contract No. 21-06-74-12 to the Joint Committee for Cannery Training Program, Inc. Because contractors conducting research and development projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely, this report does not necessarily represent the official opinion or policy of the Department of Labor. The contractor is solely responsible for the contents of this report.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

Stock Number 029-000-00326-2

CE 017 413

The Office of Research and Development of the Office of Policy, Evaluation and Research, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, was authorized first under the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) of 1962, and then under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) of 1973, to conduct research, experimentation, and demonstration to solve social and economic problems relative to the employment and training of unemployed and underemployed workers. Research also includes national longitudinal surveys of age cohorts of the population at critical transition stages in working life which examine the labor market experience of these cohorts. Studies are conducted on labor market structures and operations, obstacles to employment, mobility, how individuals do job searches, and various problems that pertain particularly to disadvantaged persons. Experimental or demonstration projects may test a new technique of intervention, a different institutional arrangement for delivery, or innovative ways to combine resources.

Analyses of the results of the most significant of these studies, descriptions of process, handbooks of procedures, or other products designed specifically for planners, administrators, and operators in the CETA system are issued as monographs in a continuing series. Information concerning all projects in process or completed during the previous 3 years is contained in an annual catalog of activities, Research and Development Projects. This publication and those in the monograph series may be obtained, upon request, from:

Inquiries Unit
Employment and Training Administration
U.S. Department of Labor
Room 10225 Patrick Henry Building
601 D Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20213

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report presents the results of a U.S. Department of Labor funded Experimental and Demonstration Project in the Northern California canning industry which began in the Fall of 1972. Over the federal project period to 1975, many people were helpful in completing the evaluation of the project. We especially wish to acknowledge the following:

From the California State Council of Cannery and Food Processing Unions:

Freddy Sanchez, President; Mike R. Elorduy, Secretary-Treasurer; and Harry Polland of Brundage, Beeson, Tayer and Kovich.

From the California Processors, Inc.:

James Watson, Vice President of Industrial Relations, Hunt Wesson Foods; Paul Schaefer, Tri-Valley Growers; and Jim Eichman, California Processors, Inc.

From CODA, Inc., training contractor Randall Conway, President; Bill McGrath, Vice President; and Tony Gregory, Training Director.

From tne U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Robert Greene and Fred Tello, project officers.

FOREWORD

This monograph is an account of one effort to convert an economic and human waste--the nonproductive time of laid-off workers--into an individual and community asset.

The effort began as an Experimental and Demonstration project funded by the Employment and Training Administration. The project provided training and stipends for laid-off, low-skilled workers in the California canning industry which made trainees eligible for promotion to jobs offering more pay per hour and more hours per year, and substantially increasing earnings.

At the conclusion of the project, the employers and the union agreed to continue the training program at the employers' expense, and incorporated the training into the collective bargaining agreement.

Subsequently, a class action suit filed against the companies and the union, asserting that minority employees had been discriminated against by the institutional arrangements under which they worked, was tried in the U.S. District Court.

The affected class (in terms of the suit) was preponderantly Spanish-speaking women, some Spanish-speaking men, and some blacks and Chinese-Americans who earned moderate wages with limited weeks of employment and little opportunity for advancement.

Previous class action suits which alleged discrimination in the telephone and steel industries resulted in large cash awards assessed against the employers to be paid to affected employees.

In this case, the U.S. District Court, in addition to awarding compensatory payments, specifically upheld the training program as an efficacious response to the problem of prior institutionalized discrimination. Thus, a new tool was added to those that can be used to reduce discrimination in employment, that had its origin in the Employment and Training Administration's Research and Development program.

In time, the industry training program concentrated on skill instruction, while local public schools were persuaded to provide basic education and literacy training.

Thus, an R&D model was tested and modified, is in use in one industry, and is ready for further use, either through joint labor-management efforts, or under the auspices of one or the other of these parties.

HOWARD ROSEN
Director
Office of Research
and Development

PREFACE

The idea of training workers when they are laid off so that they might return to work sooner or at better paying jobs has long been attractive. When the unemployment rate began to rise in 1970, after its nearly decade long decline, the Office of Research and Development, Employment and Training Administration U.S. Department of Labor, funded an Experimental and Demonstration lay-off time training (LOTT) project in Antioch-Pittsburg, California. The area has small residential communities, but a large industrial base and is located about 45 miles from Oakland, California. Antioch was the site of a prior project which had successfully trained minority, disadvantaged youth to enter the area's industrial plants and the community seemed a logical choice for the project. The industries were laying off workers, including many of the former trainees, and it seemed intuitively clear that more training would allow the workers to return to work in better paying jobs when employment began to improve.

It developed that there were flaws in the logic, as well as operational problems in the program, and the project was not successful. But the original idea remained appealing and the assessment report argued for a shift in the focus of the project from training for the general labor market to training for a specific industry. In particular, an industry such as the canning industry, with a seasonal pattern of layoff seemed appropriate. There had been it turned out, an earlier effort by a cannery workers local union to participate in the first LOTT program. The local leaders provided contacts that lead to discussions with industry and union leaders. The parties were receptive, in part because they were facing civil rights litigation. Ultimately the companies and the union in the Northern California canning industry agreed to participate and a three year program began. The canning industry project was quite successful in meeting the project objectives and the training program was eventually included in a court approved Equal Employment Opportunity agreement.

This report presents the evaluation results from the three years of experimentation together with a review of the predecessor project. Depending on the reader's interest, the report can be read at any of three levels. The final chapter (V) summarizes the entire experience, the conclusions, the impacts, and the role of training in affirmative action and presents the major policy implications. For somewhat more depth the conclusion sections of each chapter can be reviewed. Those interested in the rich body of the research findings may read the chronological development of the project as it is presented in the main chapters.

CONTENTS

PREFACE vii

CHAPTER I: TRAINING LAID OFF WORKERS IN ANTIOCH AND PITTSBURG, CALIFORNIA 1

The First LOTT Demonstration 1
The First Year Results 3
The Second Year Results 4
Project Assessment 6
Conclusions from the First Demonstration 8

CHAPTER II: TRAINING LAID OFF CANNERY WORKERS: THE FIRST YEAR 11

The First Year Training Program: Job Advancement Training 11
The First Year Results 14
Trainee Characteristics 14
The Results of Training 18
Bidding 23
Advancement 25
Assessment 31
Net Impact of the Training 32
Cost-Benefit Analysis 36
Affirmative Action Gains 40
Employer and Union Views 41
Manpower Problems 41
Expected Benefits of the Training Program 42
Impact of the Experimental Program 44
Program Problems 45
Conclusions from the First Year Cannery LOTT Program 46
Consensus for the Second Year Program 49

CHAPTER III: TRAINING LAID OFF CANNERY WORKERS: THE SECOND YEAR 51

The Affirmative Action Cannery Training Program 51
The Second Year Results: Job Proficiency Training 53
Bidding 55
Job Trials 63
Job Trial Success 67
Advancement 70

The Second Year Results: ESL and ARC 71
Bidding 72
Job Trials 73
Advancement 74
Analysis of Variations Between Plants in Job Trial Rates 74
Assessment 79
Affirmative Action Gains 80
Net Impact of Training 81
Cost-Benefit Analysis 82
Conclusions from the Second Year Cannery LOTT Program 83

CHAPTER IV: THE FUTURE OF CANNERY TRAINING 87

The Third Year Program 87
The Wait for the Conciliation Agreement 88
The Conciliation Agreement and the Consent Decree 89
Implementing the Agreement 91
Conclusions about the Future LOTT Cannery Programs 92

CHAPTER V: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY ANALYSIS 95

Summary 95
Conclusions 99
Program Impacts 100
Analysis: The Role of Training in Affirmative Action Adjustments 105
The Collective Bargaining Agreement 108
Affirmative Action Policy 108
Training 109
Policy Implications 109

APPENDIX A: METHODOLOGY FOR INCOME ANALYSIS OF FIRST YEAR TRAINEES 113

APPENDIX B: TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIATIONS IN BIDDING AND JOB TRIAL RATES 115

CHAPTER I

TRAINING LAID OFF WORKERS IN ANTIOCH AND PITTSBURG, CALIFORNIA

The First LOTT Demonstration

In the Spring of 1970, employment in California sharply declined. Aerospace companies reduced payrolls in response to national cuts in spending and other employers began laying off workers as national economic policies sought to counter the rapid inflation of the peak Vietnam War period. The Antioch-Pittsburg industrial area, 30 minutes East of Oakland, shared in this economic downturn, and the Industrial Manpower Center (IMC), serving the employers in the area by training disadvantaged young people, began to find its former students returning for visits after being laid off. Having been among the last hired as the economy reached the lowest unemployment rate since World War II, they were, as the folk-wisdom of American cities holds, the first fired.

The layoffs posed both a problem and an opportunity. The policy problem was to determine whether the period of layoff could be used in a constructive way. Hopefully the workers could either return to work earlier or at a higher level of employment or with better prospects of advancement. The existing training center offered an opportunity to use its skills and good-will in a program designed to explore these questions. The industrial Manpower Center was scheduled to be closed down, in any case, because it was completing its second year as a demonstration project under U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) support, the usual limit on such projects. Converting the center to a new concept seemed a logical action, especially since, by the testimony of the local employers, it had been successful in its previous mission. DOL therefore contracted for a demonstration layoff time training (LOTT) program. The purpose was to examine the policy issues and if the idea of training during layoff was found feasible, to study the operational problems which would be encountered if the idea were to be used more broadly.

Although the return of former IMC students provided some impetus for developing the LOTT program, the primary objective of the program when funded was to serve another group of workers. The image was that there was a group of workers who had been attached for several years to a single industry and perhaps to a single employer, but who were in deadended jobs which subjected them to periodic layoffs. The assumption was that during layoff these workers could be assisted in advancing if they received remedial education (non-skills training) and group counseling. It was also assumed that these workers would

have a reasonable assurance of being recalled to work by their industry or employer.

The program had a secondary objective: To serve laid off workers who had weak industry and employer ties and little prospect of recall to work by their prior employers. This group might correspond more closely to the former IMC trainees, but since they were required to have been laid off from work, the project focus would shift from its prior emphasis on those who may never have worked to those who were already in the labor market.

The Antioch-Pittsburg project had these essential elements:

- The workers had to have been laid off within the last six months and be eligible for Unemployment Insurance (UI) or a Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) allowance.

- Adult basic education in reading and math through the high school level would be provided using programmed texts developed by the contractor. A complete General Education Development (GED) program would also be offered leading to a high school equivalency certificate.

- The academic courses would be supplemented by trainer-led group discussion and sensitivity sessions, often involving industry and union representatives. These latter sessions were known as Human Resources Development or HRD training and along with the basic education had been the core offering in the IMC program.

- The plan was to supplement the core curriculum with special training components, developed with the assistance of employers, to meet the special needs of workers who were subject to recall to work.

- The training was intended to be flexible, with maximum participation ranging from 15 to 22 weeks.

- A training stipend was provided under the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) for those who were not receiving UI benefits and $20 per week was paid to UI claimants to cover meals and transportation expenses.

- The program intended to meet employer needs with a special curriculum designed to train workers in specific subjects identified as needed by the employers.

- The program also intended to meet community needs. It was assumed that employers, unions, and community groups and institutions would respond favorably to the training program because they would feel that it was meeting the needs of the community.

The First Year Results

The first year results were disappointing. Assessment by an independent contractor found that the program was pursuing its secondary objectives (serving laid off workers who did not expect to be recalled) and that the program had not attracted the support it needed (for referral of trainees) from employers and the Unemployment Insurance Service. The assessment also found that over 56 per cent of the workers drawing Unemployment Insurance stayed in the program less than 30 days, 1/4 to 1/3 of the intended training time, and these were the trainees who most nearly represented the primary target group.

Rather than attracting older workers who expected recall, the program had attracted predominantly younger workers, 1/3 of whom had to be paid MDTA stipends because they had so little work history as to be ineligible for UI payments. Nearly half of the trainees came on the basis of referrals from former IMC graduates or from the early LOTT program enrollees. Obviously, this meant that the program was operating within the basic dynamics of the former project and had many of the same kind of trainees.

The failure of the program to attract employer and State Unemployment Insurance Service support is dramatized by the fact that only five per cent of the trainees had been referred by employers and only twelve per cent by the state agency. These would have been the sources for the primary target trainees.

A special panel established by DOL found the heart of the problem to be in the existing seniority and related practices common in the area. Thus:[1]

> The industry in the Antioch-Pittsburg area is rather highly unionized and has the promotional patterns and seniority systems that generally exist in unionized plants. This situation in itself seems to have led both employers any many employees to be skeptical about the pertinance of the project's mission: many employers were hesitant to cooperate or to become directly involved for fear that to do so would imply to trainees something of a commitment on their part to recall or promote them outside the provisions of the collective bargaining

agreement; laid off union members, on the other hand, seemed to have perceived their seniority as the critical factor in their recall or prospective future promotions, hence, more often than not, were unpersuaded that time spent in training would be rewarding. Finally, here as elsewhere, the economic downturn of the past two years has softened employer interest in innovative manpower programs. Many employers have even long-term skilled employees on lay-off. This economic change made it more difficult, or prolonged the period it took for participants in the program to gain placement in new or former employment, hence making the possible payoff from training appear more remote to them.

The Second Year Results

Reflecting these findings major modifications at the start of the second year were aimed at shifting the project focus towards the primary objective. These were:

- Limit trainees to those who qualified for UI.
- Analyze employer problems in order to identify ways in which the primary target group workers could be attracted.
- Search for an opportunity to move out to plant or union hall locations.
- Provide a development and placement service so that the UI beneficiaries would remain longer in the program, with more regular attendance.
- Establish a vocational counseling service to assist those who needed to identify vocational goals.

The second year's results were as disappointing as the first year's, although from the vantage point of studying the original employment and training policy issue, some important lessons were learned. The first lesson is really an old one, but one which is hard to avoid having to relearn: There is an inherent conflict between the needs of those who must operate

---

[1]The panel consisted of: Professor Sidney Gardner, Graduate School of Business, Stanford University; Mr. Arthur W. Kirsch, E. F. Shelly and Company, Inc.; Mr. Karl Kunze, Lockheed California Company; and Professor Fred H. Schmidt, Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California at Los Angles, panel chairman.

a program and the needs of those who sponsor experimental and demonstration projects. In the LOTT case, the issue was the policy of only accepting UI beneficiaries as trainees. The local director of the training program saw fairly quickly that too few enrollees were coming under the policy, and as with most operators, he needed students. So, the policy was quietly rescinded. The action did demonstrate to DOL, as sponsor of the project, that finding the primary target group would continue to be difficult. But, of course, from an experimental point-of-view the ideal would have been to leave the policy in place even though inadequate numbers of trainees came and to aggressively pursue an answer to the question why.

Fortunately, the project was presented with two very clear cut opportunities to test the response to the program by primary target group members. The first instance involved a glass container manufacturing company, which informed the project that it would be shutting down its plant for four or five weeks in order to rebuild the furnaces. All but 30 per cent of the 350 production workers would be laid off. The management agreed to co-sponsor a special LOTT program for these workers. It provided curriculum recommendations and strongly urged workers to participate through company bulletins and posters and through notices included in each worker's final paycheck. Project staff interviewed employees on the plant's premises, prior to shutdown, to determine the level of the workers' interest. Conditions seemed ideal, and 50 per cent of a sample of 65 workers expressed interest in joining the program. But when the shutdown came, only four persons enrolled.

When plant operations resumed a follow-up survey of 128 workers was conducted. Sixty-six per cent of the workers interviewed chose to use their time for vacations or relaxation, 15 per cent did household chores and 10 per cent either worked or looked for work. Only 11 (8.6 per cent) were unaware that the program had been available to them.

A second, almost identical opportunity arose when the Association of Western Pulp and Paper Workers agreed to sponsor their own LOTT program in their union hall for temporarily laid off members. The conditions were very good. The union publicized the program widely, gave it full support as being its own program and helped project staff contact 55 members on temporary layoff. No one responded.

These two experiments were decisive. Clearly the primary target group of workers were not interested in training for its own sake while on layoff. Something more in the form of a tangible return was required.

Project Assessment

For the present purpose, understanding the evaluation to the final project, only the special study of employer practices made as a part of the project assessment is relevant.[2]

Four sectors (steel, chemicals, glass and paper) were selected, reflecting the importance of manufacturing in the area. Many of these companies had had contact with project staff frequently. Therefore they were assumed to have a knowledge of LOTT and a sympathetic disposition toward the interview.

Eight companies were contacted and all cooperated. Each employer was interviewed for one to two hours with much of the interview content conforming to the analysis contained in the Doeringer-Piore study[3] so as to test their findings about internal labor markets. Supplementary written materials such as union contracts, training material and affirmative action plans were collected for later study.

Simply stated, the interviews provided massive support of the earlier findings. None of the companies could identify any role for layoff time training within their operations, nor could they visualize such a program having much appeal to their workers. When pressed, three companies could recall one or two cases where an individual's job performance was hampered by educational deficiencies and conceded the LOTT training might be useful to them. But for most people who reached a dead-end at some stage for reasons of competence, the decision was normally a joint one on the part of the company, union and worker. The numbers, even so, were surprisingly small.

In all cases the employers had clearly defined entry points and promotion ladders. The great volume of new hires was at the labor or helper level and consisted of an undifferentiated group. Movement out of these labor pools occurred as opportunities arose to bid on entering points of a ladder of progression.

---

[2] An Experiment in Using Lay-off Time Constructively for Improving Workers' Future Employability and Advancement Potential. Second Year Report Contract No. DL 82-34-70-31, Report No. DLMA 82-34-70-31-2. United States R & D Corporation, 15 Columbus Circle, New York, New York 10023.

[3] Peter B. Doeringer and Michael J. Piore, Internal Labor Markets & Manpower Analysis (D.C. Heath and Company, Lexington, Mass. 1971.)

There was great variation in these progression systems, even within a given multi-plant company.

One example may suffice. One company was in the process of closing some operations permanently at one plant. Management had chosen a progression system linked to a sequence of machines whereas other companies put similar machine lines into a single ladder. The union had chosen some years ago to abolish outside hires for the more skilled jobs at or near the top of these ladders. The consequence of all this was that the company as it closed down the plant could transfer the machinery to another plant within commuting distance, but not the workers. The workers there, in the same union but a different local, claimed the new jobs as their own under the umbrella of the prohibition against outside hiring.

None of the companies could identify any problems with their existing systems for job training. All had some highly skilled maintenance people and replacements were sought as needed from a combination of outside hire and apprentice training. Most training was of an understudy nature. The next person in line by seniority for a given job normally had abundant opportunity to learn the job by performing it when the regular holder was absent for vacation or for other reasons.

Some companies recognized turnover as a problem, although replacements were not hard to find. It appears the labor pool in some cases is a large fraction of the workforce and so turnover may be a function of limited promotional opportunity. No one in these instances could find in training a basis for reducing turnover and thereby recruitment and other costs.

As a part of the community leader interviews additional employers familiar with the project were contacted. The composite picture that emerged supported the view that the previous IMC project appealed to employers as it met some real needs. Many were trying to add minorities to the workforce. IMC became a source that an employer newly engaged in minority hiring could trust. The candidates were already pre-screened, given remedial training so that hiring expectations would be met and, in a sense, certified as not too militant. Finally IMC fit the realities of the internal labor market practices since it focused only on the entry point at a time when employers wanted to change the racial mix of their workforces. At the time of the field work, nearly three years after IMC's demise, many employers recalled the earlier project with fondness and expressed anger at its loss. None saw LOTT as anything but an inexplicable replacement for the real thing.

269-748 O - 78 - 3

All this was a reminder that race had been at the center of manpower policy for a decade. Established ways of manpower utilization have been modified when an underlying racial cast brought a manpower problem to the surface. What emerged from this study of employers was that layoff time training would become viable in employers' eyes only if discrimination aspects of current manpower utilization made it relevant. The need to upgrade past the entry point might be the stimulus. Workers in the system on layoff might emerge as a much sought after group. Personal and employer interests could then coincide.

Conclusion From the First Demonstration

The conclusion for the project's major objective was clear:

Non-skills training (basic education, GED, and counseling) will not be attractive to laid off workers who expect to be recalled to work, and are in industries which have highly developed internal labor markets, with clear lines of progression, limited entry points and promotion based primarily on seniority.

The reasons for the conclusions are:

a. The workers will learn the specific skills and knowledge to advance through informal on-the-job training;

b. Changes and turnover in the workforce will be sufficiently slow and predictable to permit training to occur as needed;

c. The jobs themselves will be relatively highly systematized and controlled with relatively low levels of skill and expertise required.

d. The layoffs will probably be seen by the workers as windfalls to be enjoyed as vacation or used for personal concerns.

But what about LOTT? Did the first demonstration write the final word on layoff time training? Several clues were present in the Antioch-Pittsburg project suggesting that another form of LOTT might be effective. The clues were:

- None of the plants involved had seasonal patterns of layoff, but clearly there are highly seasonal industries and they would probably have unique problems.

- According to the contractor, unions representing unskilled workers were somewhat interested in LOTT, while their counterparts for skilled workers were not.

- None of the plants had pressing affirmative action or other manpower problems, but other industries did.

- Several seasonal cannery workers had come to the Antioch-Pittsburg training and had told the staff about special employment problems experienced by women and minority men in the canneries.

Drawing on these clues and knowledge which the assessment subcontractor had about the canning industry, the project staff interviewed cannery employer and union representatives and found an immediate, enthusiastic response to the LOTT idea. Not surprisingly, the canning industry and union were faced with affirmative action litigation which might cost them several million dollars unless they could advance women and minority men more rapidly. Race (and sex) was back in the picture as a powerful motive force for manpower training.

The following chapter describes and analyzes the next step in layoff time training experiments, an industry specific approach for the Northern California Canning Industry.

CHAPTER II

TRAINING LAID OFF CANNERY WORKERS: THE FIRST YEAR

The First Year Training Program--Job Advancement Training (1972-1973)

The canning industry met all the criteria which the training contractor had identified as a necessary basis for a successful program.

1. In its internal processes of job selection, the industry required workers to be specificcally qualified for each job in addition to having the necessary seniority. On the better paying jobs, workers must pass job trials which tested their qualifications.

2. The collective bargaining agreement, which structures the internal labor market, allowed outside hiring in all jobs. If there were no qualified high seniority workers, then the needed people were hired from outside or junior people were selected. There were almost no training programs to help high seniority workers gain the skills to advance.

3. A large number of high seniority workers were apparently passed over for advancement because of deficiencies which training in basic education, literacy and work orientation could correct. The many Mexican-American and Chinese-American workers who did not speak English were of especial concern. Additionally, in the industry-union on-the-job training program for mechanics and electricians, over 50 per cent of the men who had applied had failed the required written aptitude test. Some plants had not been able to qualify a single worker for the training.

4. Large numbers of the workers who were not being advanced experienced regular, extended layoffs, from which they were assured of recall, and during which they could participate in the LOTT program.

5. Employer and union representatives said they would strongly support the program and encourage their workers to participate. Their support was based on a perception that they had a manpower problem of mutual concern involving the passed over workers

(advancing women and minorities) and that the problem might be solved by the LOTT training.

The objective for the first year of the new industry-specific demonstration, then, was to demonstrate that non-skills training (basic education, literacy training and work orientation) could be useful when focused on a specific industry (canning) which met the criteria.

Though interested the parties were unwilling to proceed without continued Department of Labor financial support. Details on this and a related research component were finally agreed to in a conference of the parties attended by the Department of Labor project officer.

With a favorable foundation for the training effort, the contractor began a planning effort with the employers and the unions. Policy authority was vested in an employer-union Joint Committee for Cannery Training Program. Employer representatives were sponsored by the employer organization, California Processors, Inc., which negotiates a collective bargaining agreement every three years for 29 canning companies, together operating 76 plants in Northern California. Union committee members consisted of state officers and local union representatives sponsored by the California State Council of Cannery and Food Processing Unions (International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers).

Because the need to understand the workings of the internal labor market had been a critical finding of the earlier project, the contractor visited many plants, talking to plant managers, first line supervisors, personnel officers and a couple hundred cannery workers. The process for job bidding was examined as were the structure and role of a large number of the cannery jobs.

The field investigation was supplemented by a two-day conference on the role of collective bargaining and industrial unionism. Since the project was going to be a training intervention into a single industry labor market, the DOL project officer and the evaluation subcontractor advised that it was essential that the training contractor and his staff understand how the collective bargaining, grievance and arbitration processes work. The critical issue was to determine how one trains workers to use the processes for advancement without infringing on the prerogatives of the local union or the employers, a most difficult task.

After the planning period, the Joint Committee and DOL agreed on a program with the following features:

- Training would be provided in three sites, Sacramento, Modesto, and Oakland. These areas together employ 43 per cent of all the cannery workers in the state at the peak of the canning season (34,000 of 78,200). They have an even larger share of the total cannery employment in that they engage 54 per cent of the "regular" cannery workers, those who work full-time or nearly full-time (more than 1400 hours per year).

  A fourth training site was added during the year in Hayward, a community about 20 miles south of Oakland. Because Antioch was approximately the mid-point between the dispersed sites, the central training headquarters was maintained there.

- The courses would consist of basic education in reading and math, and English as a Second Language (ESL). These courses would be supplemented with information and group counseling to acquaint the workers with employment opportunities and the processes of selection, and to build their self-confidence. Although it was expected that the basic education course would use the programmed texts from the earlier projects, the plan was to develop additional material focused on actual plant work requirements and skills. The ESL course would use a method known as Situational Reinforcement (SR) which would allow all of the work to focus on the problems of communication in the plant environment. The ESL and counseling would use role playing, video taping and other techniques to aid the workers in seeing and changing their attitudes and behavior toward the processes of advancement.

- Two main actions were taken to build and maintain union and employer support and involvement in the program. One was to use the local union halls for the training so that both workers and union officials would see the program as their own. Secondly, "interpretation" of the collective bargaining contract would be left in the hands of the union officials and the plant personnel officers. If they had different interpretations, the workers would have to work with them about that, not the training staff.

- The program would be advertised extensively in the plants during the 1972 canning season and training would begin in late November.

- Workers would be admitted to training on the basis of seniority, the most senior first. The training would

be treated as a union benefit, meaning that workers had a right to go to the training without making prior commitments about whether they would bid for higher paying jobs in the next season.

- The trainees would be paid stipend payments of $2.50 to compensate them for travel, child care and other expenses. The stipend payments would therefore not interfere with the workers' receipt of Unemployment Insurance payments during the off season.

In addition to the formal features of the program the training contractor made an informal, but a quite real and important commitment to treat the project as an experiment. The earlier LOTT project had, in fact, suffered because the real focus tended to be on operations. The research component was treated as an uncomfortable necessity and answering public policy questions seemed clearly secondary to maintaining a full classroom.

For this demonstration the DOL project officer insisted on a careful experimental evaluation design. The training contractor met monthly, and in the planning period almost weekly, with the research subcontractor to explore the implications of possible operational changes for answering the broader question of whether LOTT training was appropriate in a seasonal industry.

The First Year Results

The basic operational results were as pleasing as the earlier LOTT experiment had been disappointing. This is not to say that all was perfect or that the project impact was such as to solve the industry's affirmative action problem. But the foundation objectives were met: Target group workers came to training sessions, learning occurred as measured by pre and post tests, there was widespread support and participation in the program by union and employer representatives and at least in the plants with larger numbers of trainees, there was a noticeable increase in bidding for better paying jobs.

These results bear further examination.

Trainee Characteristics

The program attracted 1,000 applications, although it was only possible to serve 409 workers. All of the trainees said they planned to return to work in the canneries the next season and they had, on the average, 10 years of seasonal seniority in

plant work. Clearly, the program attracted people with a strong industry and employer attachment.

The trainees maintained their strong industry ties even though 47 per cent of the men and 24 per cent of the women found other work in the off season. Nearly half of the men (43 per cent) and a third of the women (29 per cent) looked for off season work, but were unable to find it. Off season work experience varied a good deal by race: 36 per cent of the Anglos, 26 per cent of the Blacks, 28 per cent of the Mexican-Americans and none of the Chinese-Americans found off season employment.

Table 1 presents the off season activities of trainees.

Table 1

OFF SEASON EXPERIENCE OF
FIRST YEAR CANNERY TRAINEES

Use of Lay-Off Time	Women Per cent	Men Per cent	Total Per cent
Field Work	4%	32%	7%
Hospital Work	5%	---	4%
Other Work	15%	15%	15%
Looking for Work but Unsuccessful	29%	43%	31%
Housework	46%	4%	41%
Attending School	1%	---	1%
Other Non-Work Activities	1%	6%	1%
	100%	100%	100%

Nearly half of the trainees were Mexican-Americans (48 per cent), but the proportion varied greatly between training sites. Hayward had the high proportion, 81 per cent, and Oakland the low, 19 per cent. Chinese-Americans made up 31 per cent of the Sacramento trainees, but there were no Chinese-Americans in either the Oakland or Modesto programs. These facts point to

an important early finding in the project: there were great differences in the training populations between the sites.

The differences between the training sites extended to age and sex, and reflected basic differences in the area labor markets. Modesto had a significantly younger group, with less seniority in the plants. Many more men came to the Modesto training than elsewhere and there was a majority of Mexican-Americans, as well as a significant minority (22 per cent) who were Anglo. Oakland had a predominantly Black group (75 per cent) and they were older and had more seniority than trainees in other sites. Sacramento had a comparatively balanced group.

The following tables, 2, 3 and 4 present the race, sex and age characteristics of the trainees:

Table 2

RACE OF FIRST YEAR CANNERY TRAINEES

Training Site	Anglo	Black	Mexican/ American	Chinese/ American	Other	Total
Hayward						
Number:	-	-	25	2	4	31
Per cent:	-	-	81%	6%	13%	100%
Modesto						
Number:	28	2	96	-	3	129
Per cent:	22%	2%	74%	-	2%	100%
Oakland						
Number:	9	120	30	-	1	153
Per cent:	5%	75%	19%	-	1%	100%
Sacramento						
Number:	3	10	46	28	2	89
Per cent:	3%	11%	52%	31%	2%	100%
Total						
Number:	40	132	197	30	10	409
Per cent:	10%	32%	48%	7%	2%	100%

Table 3

SEX OF FIRST
YEAR CANNERY TRAINEES

Training Site	Men		Women		Total	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Hayward	5	16%	26	84%	31	100%
Modesto	31	24%	98	76%	129	100%
Oakland	7	4%	153	96%	160	100%
Sacramento	7	8%	82	92%	89	100%
Total	50	12%	359	88%	409	100%

Table 4

AGE OF FIRST
YEAR CANNERY TRAINEES

Training Site	Average Age
Hayward	44
Modesto	39
Oakland	49
Sacramento	45
Total	45

Mirroring the skewed pay bracket distributions in the plants, the women trainees on the average were in pay Bracket VI and the men in Bracket III. Bracket I is the highest pay bracket. Few of the women held jobs in the top three brackets, but 54 per cent of the men trainees were in one of these brackets. Table 5 shows the pay bracket distribution of the trainees.

Table 5

PAY BRACKETS OF
FIRST YEAR CANNERY TRAINEES

Pay Bracket	Women Per cent	Men Per cent	Total Per cent
I	--	--	--
II	--	9%	1%
III	5%	45%	9%
IV	25%	38%	27%
V	18%	6%	17%
VI	16%	2%	14%
VII	7%	--	6%
VIII	29%	--	25%
Total	100%	100%	100%

A final characteristic of interest was that half of the trainees had received their basic education in foreign countries, 45 per cent in Mexico and 5 per cent in other countries, primarily China.

The Results of Training

The obvious differences in the trainee characteristics carried with them some equally obvious differences in program needs. For example, Chinese-Americans in Sacramento were all women and nearly all of them registered in ESL. Sacramento therefore required ESL responsive to both Chinese-American and Mexican-American cultures while Mexican-Americans were the sole ESL target group in Modesto and little ESL was needed in Oakland. But, registration also produced a puzzling result: registration in Modesto lagged well behind the other sites.

The puzzle in Modesto turned out to have a counterpart event in Oakland. The initial basic education course in Oakland

attracted 20, very senior, Black women. Within a few weeks trainee interest flagged, attendance declined and many dropped out. Obviously, the women did not feel the training would help them enough in the plants or their personal lives to make the effort worthwhile.

Along with the lack of interest in basic education, the training staff also noticed a great deal of interest, and high attendance, on the one day a week when the job, bidding system and work rules information and group counseling were provided. On the advice of the training contractor, the Joint Committee decided that the basic education course was simply a failure in Oakland, but that a new, separate course was needed devoted exclusively to information and counseling related to employment and advancement. The new course was three weeks long and was called Advancement Related Counseling (ARC). It was opened in Modesto, as well as Oakland, and it seemed to meet a need in both places among workers, primarily women, who did not need basic education or ESL.

The emergence of ARC helped clarify some of the differences in needs felt by the various ethnic groups. Blacks and Anglos responded strongly to ARC. In Oakland the attendance rate averaged 90 per cent, contrasting sharply with the serious attendance problems experienced previously in Oakland's basic education. The differences in the registration patterns is presented in Table 6.

Table 6

FIRST YEAR COURSE
REGISTRATION BY ETHNIC GROUP

Course	Anglo	Black	Mexican/ American	Chinese/ American	Other	Total
Advancement Related Counseling						
Number	24	102	33	0	1	160
Per cent	60%	77%	17%	0%	10%	39%
ESL/Basic Education						
Number	16	30	164	30	9	249
Per cent	40%	23%	83%	100%	90%	61%
Total						
Number	40	132	197	30	10	409
Per cent	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The emergence of ARC had another effect, it crystallized the realization that one of the biggest barriers to the advancement of women was their lack of knowledge about the jobs, and the rules and processes for advancement. For example, testing indicated that only 13 per cent of the men and 19 per cent of the women trainees knew about the bidding system, the formal process for applying for higher level positions. And many of those who did know about bidding did not appear to understand well how it worked, or how it affected them. The following story, using a fictional name, illustrates a common trainee situation:

> Bertha Smith has worked in an Oakland tomato canning plant for 25 years, averaging about 3 months work per year. Her job has always been to sort tomatoes as they go by on a conveyor belt. To get to and go home from her job she has always entered and left by the same door, near the belts, in the 4 acre plant. During work, she always stays at her station, except to go to coffee and lunch in the cafeteria.
>
> One of the signs on the bulletin board says ROAMING IS PROHIBITED so she hasn't gone into other areas of the huge plant and doesn't even know about most of the machines or the jobs involved in the rest of the canning process. And, because she doesn't know about the other jobs, she has never paid any attention to the announcements on the bulletin board about openings in better paying jobs for which she might have bid. Her long seniority would easily place her at the head of the list for a great many jobs which she could have learned easily. The tour of the plant which she got as part of the training program at the union hall was an eye opening experience.

In addition to providing information, the ARC course also sought to deal with the timidity many of the women felt about applying for better jobs. They were clearly hampered by strong social norms which said that some jobs were women's work and others men's work. Officially, in fact, up until 1967 there had been two such lists and many of the attitudes were still deeply ingrained, in the women as well as the men. The attitudes were not limited to plant life, but for many of the workers were strong features of their cultures outside the plant. The story of another worker, again using a fictional name, presents the problem in graphic terms.

Rosemary Peters and her husband had worked in Sacramento canneries for about 18 years. She has only held seasonal jobs while her husband has a year round electrician's job, making him part of the "regular" work force. The plant's personnel manager pursuaded Rosemary to try the job of lift-truck driver which might give her nearly year round work. She did well at the job for nearly a month, but came into work one morning with a palid, exhausted look and said she wanted her old job back. Her request upset the personnel manager because she was one of his affirmative action success stories and he asked her why. She explained that she and her husband had fought all night because he felt she was wrong in taking a job which had always been a man's job. In his view she was depriving a man of work, preventing him from supporting his family. She was left with the choice, keep her lift-truck job and lose her marriage, or go back to women's work.

All of the training was accompanied by pre-training and post-training tests to measure skill levels and the degree of learning progress. In all courses, the trainees progressed faster than would have been expected with average public school instruction and so the training must be deemed successful in terms of the standardized academic measures. But, the test scores pointed out paradoxes important to the program.

One paradox was that in basic education, the training director found, "Although we taught and the students learned, there was no direction". The fundamental problem with basic education he felt was that "we don't know where the instruction is going" because it was the component where they were least able to demonstrate a connection between training and future chances of advancement. "There is no beginning and end to the course; no standards for entry or exit." Although the students progressed about one half a grade level (.43) for each month of training, a pace almost five times as fast as would be expected in public school, there was no way within the training itself to answer whether this better equipped them for work in the canneries or not.

The training director did note that in the few instances where trainees had specific job goals, they were able to provide effective training. For example, several trainees wanted to work in the laboratories which test samples of the products being canned, but they did not have the necessary mathematical skills. The project staff obtained lab tests and product scales from the plants and developed a specific math curriculum for

the jobs. The training director recommended that the basic education course only be kept if it could be focused on such specific job skills.

Another paradox pointed out by the testing was the discovery that the ESL trainees, who received no math instruction, nevertheless progressed by almost three quarters of a grade level in math. The training director thought that the result indicated that the trainees were not remedial learners in the traditional academic subjects which they would have studied in their native country's schools. They began the training at second grade speaking level (1.7), but at a fourth grade arithmetic level (4.2). Training in the English language appears to have increased their ability to use other skills.

Third, the longer training periods did not produce commensurately greater increases in learning. For ESL, the training director recommended the course be limited to ten weeks.

Finally, the staff came to recognize that the best available language tests did not measure the speaking skills being taught in the ESL course. The research subcontractor's own educational consultant reviewed the tests used in the project and noted that the project was destined to encounter a frustration experienced by all ESL instructors; there are no good tests available for their course's objectives.

The proceeding discussions establish that the basic operational objectives were achieved. That is, target group trainees came to the classes, the classes were generally responsive to trainee needs and learning occurred. It is very important, of course, that the training program had to be very flexible and respond to different needs in the various locations which emerged during the program. Thus, basic education in Oakland was dropped entirely, the new Advancement Related Counseling was offered in Oakland and in Modesto, and, using the staff resources made available by the changes in Oakland, a new combined Basic Education-ESL course was opened in Hayward. Finally, a follow-up ESL course using the project methods and materials was established by the public school's Adult Education program in Sacramento.

In our opinion, these developments do not indicate a failure of the program to achieve its objectives. Rather, they point to the most important lesson of the first year of cannery training: even within a seemingly homogeneous industry sector (the Northern California Canning Industry), there are such diverse needs that a training program must be sufficiently flexible in its design and operation to adapt to quite different demands which are likely to arise during the course of the program. The corollary lesson

is: there must be good evaluation measures and processes which will bring emergent needs and problems to attention.

Bidding

The next evaluative question was to determine whether the trainees took the necessary steps leading to advancement. The outcome expected was that the trainees would bid for higher paying jobs in the next canning season.

Trainee follow-up interviews found that about 59 per cent of the trainees bid for a job in the 1973 season. This was a substantial increase in bidding by the trainees over the 1972 season when only 19 per cent even knew about the bidding system and fewer actually used it.

We do not have a direct bidding rate for those who did not get training, as a basis for comparison. However personnel officers in the plants with the largest groups of trainees reported an observable increase in bidding and they attributed this increase largely to the effects of the training program.

The range of bidding between the trainee groups varied markedly. Table 7 below presents the bidding rates for four of these groups drawn from the follow-up interviews. Altogether, the four trainee groups surveyed represented 72 per cent of all trainees, with the remaining trainees scattered among a number of small ethnic-training course groups.[4]

[4]For further information on the sample design, questionnaire and survey results, see Trainee Interview Report dated June 25, 1974, Center for Applied Manpower Research, Berkeley, CA 94707.

269-748 O - 75 - 3

Table 7

BIDDING RATES FOR FIRST YEAR CANNERY TRAINEES

Trainee Group	Did Not Bid	Did Bid	Bid on Job Not Requiring Job Trial	Bid on Job Requiring Job Trial
	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	
Chinese-American ESL	83%	17%	13%	4%
Mexican-American ESL	50%	50%	33%	17%
Mexican-American Basic Education	53%	47%	11%	37%
Black Women ARC	24%	76%	40%	36%
Weighted Average Estimate for All Trainees	41%	59%	29%	29%

The obvious differences are between the ethnic groups. The 17 per cent of Chinese-Americans who bid may represent an increase over what would have been the case without the program, but not a very substantial increase. Even this figure may be too high as it appears some of the bids listed existing job and so were not a bid for a higher paying jobs. Hence the results appear to be neglible for this group.

Among all of the first year trainees, about half of those who bid (29 per cent of all the trainees), bid for jobs below Bracket IV which did not require job trials. The significance of this is that the collective bargaining agreement signed at the beginning of the 1973 canning season eliminated the three lowest paying brackets (VI, VII, and VIII), automatically moving all of these jobs into Pay Bracket V. As a result, half of the trainees who bid, asked for jobs which would not provide pay increases over what they could expect without bidding at all. This in turn reduced the prospect that overall data on advancement and income would show gains for the first year trainess as compared to those who did not get training.

The main factor explaining the bidding pattern is probably that much of the bidding occurred before the new collective bargaining agreement was signed on July 26, 1973, and certainly before its new provisions could be effectively communicated to

the seasonal rank and file workers. A second factor is that some of the trainees simply decided that they wanted to keep the job they already held and so they listed it on their bid, even though there was no need to bid for a job already held.

Advancement

Advancing to a better paying job was the primary objective of the training program, although, in the canneries, there is an intermediate step for many jobs, and that is obtaining and passing a job trial. Altogether, 25 per cent of the first year trainees got job trials and 21 per cent were ultimately successful in holding jobs which required such trials. Table 8 presents these results in more detail.

Table 8

JOB TRIAL RATES FOR
FIRST YEAR CANNERY TRAINEES

Trainee Group	Bid on Job Requiring Job Trial Per cent	Received Job Trial Per cent	Successful in Job Trial Per cent
Chinese-American ESL	4%	4%	---
Mexican-American ESL	17%	13%	13%
Mexican-American Basic Education	37%	37%	32%
Black Women ARC	36%	28%	24%
Weighted Average Estimate for All Trainees	29%	25%	21%

A useful indicator of program success is the proportion of trainees who actually got a job trial from among those who bid for a job requiring such a trial. The earlier finding that only half of the trainees who bid, bid for a job requiring a job trial, makes this indicator especially important. Of those who bid for a job requiring one 84 per cent received a job trial. Of those who got a job trial, 86 per cent passed. Altogether, 73 per cent were successful in passing a job trial of those who originally bid on a job requiring one.

The job trial data suggests three preliminary conclusions: (1) The Chinese-Americans appear not to have advanced in the plants at all, hence the training appears to have had no impact on their work force status. (2) The per cent of trainees who finally held jobs requiring job trials (21 per cent) is quite low and means there was probably a small overall impact of the program. (3) That 86 per cent of those who got a job trial, passed, indicates a quite satisfactory success rate for those who reached the job trial stage.

These preliminary conclusions are confirmed by estimates of advancement in pay brackets drawn from plant records on 69 per cent of the trainees. Overall, 30 per cent of the trainees advanced one pay bracket or more. This is a slightly more favorable result than the indication that 21 per cent got and passed job trials. The difference is probably due to the fact that plants in practice don't always require a job trial or it is handled in such a low key fashion that the worker feels that he or she has simply been given the job without concern over qualifications. There is also, undoubtedly, some sampling error.

As expected from the job trial data, none of the Chinese-Americans advanced in pay bracket. Thirty-three per cent of the Mexican-Americans and 31 per cent of all the other trainees advanced one or more brackets. Four per cent of all trainees advanced two brackets and 2 per cent advanced three brackets.

Table 9 below presents the bracket movement data for the trainee segments. The most notable result is that 50 per cent of the Mexican-Americans attending Advancement Related Counseling (ARC) advanced one bracket. Almost that many in the "Other Basic Education" category advanced one or more brackets.

Table 9

BRACKET MOVEMENTS FOR
FIRST YEAR CANNERY TRAINEES

Trainee Group	Decrease in Bracket Per cent	No Change in Bracket Per cent	Increase in Bracket: One Br. Per cent	Two Brs. Per cent	Three Brs. Per cent	Cumulative One or More Brackets Per cent
Chinese-American ESL	-	100%	-	-	-	-
Mexican-American ESL	7%	63%	24%	4%	2%	30%
Total ESL	4%	74%	17%	3%	2%	22%
Chinese-American Basic Education	-	100%	-	-	-	-
Mexican-American Basic Education	5%	66%	19%	10%	-	29%
Other Basic Education	-	54%	38%	8%	-	46%
Total Basic Ed.	4%	64%	24%	8%	-	32%
Mexican-American ARC	7%	43%	50%	-	-	50%
Other ARC	6%	70%	19%	1%	4%	24%
Total ARC	6%	66%	24%	1%	3%	28%
Weighted Average Estimate for All Trainess	5%	65%	24%	4%	2%	30%

From the prior results, the Chinese-Americans are obviously a group of special interest. Why didn't they advance at all?

In our follow-up interviews, we examined several issues which were thought to have a bearing on the Chinese-American response to training. The first question is whether their goals were consistent with those of the training program and the answer is that they were not. One task for our follow-up interviewers was to determine the job goals of the trainees. Because assessing goals can be complicated, we instructed the interviewers to ask the trainees directly about their goals, to combine these answers with insights and information gained in

the responses to related questions, and then to rate each trainee in terms of whether they wanted year-round work, an improved seasonal job or to remain in their current seasonal job. The desire for year-round work or an improved seasonal job are consistent with the training program goals while remaining in the current seasonal job clearly is not. The results were striking. Eighty-seven per cent of the Chinese-Americans wanted to remain in their current seasonal jobs compared to 29 per cent of all the other trainees interviewed. Table 10 presents the job goals of the trainee study groups.

Table 10

JOB GOALS OF FIRST YEAR CANNERY TRAINEES

Job Goal in Cannery	Chin-Am ESL (n=23)	Mex-Am ESL (n=24)	Mex-Am BE (n=19)	Black ARC (n=25)
Year-round Job	--	17%	37%	40%
Better Seasonal Job	13%	50%	42%	28%
Current Seasonal Job	87%	33%	21%	32%

Why then did the Chinese-American workers attend training? The main answer seems to have been to collect the stipend payments, although they undoubtedly also enjoyed the association with their fellow workers during the off-season. Many events during the training served to convince the training staff and the evaluation subcontractor that the stipend payments were a critical factor in the decision of the Chinese-Americans to attend the training, but the events involved in inaugurating a public school ESL program in Sacramento seem the most persuasive.

The training contractor approached several communities requesting that special ESL courses be established for cannery workers using the project methods and materials. The Sacramento Unified School District agreed and started their program on January 14, 1974. Since the school district staff lacked contact with potential enrollees, they requested referral assistance from the training center in Sacramento. The project staff contacted about 15 workers who had expressed an interest in enrolling in the center's ESL component. On the first day scheduled for classes, only one woman showed up for the public ESL course. Classes were postponed until January 21, 1974, a week later. During this week, the staff at the Sacramento

project center contacted 60 laidoff cannery workers (38 Chinese-Americans, 21 Mexican-Americans and one other non-English speaking worker). On January 21, eight individuals (7 Chinese-Americans and one Mexican-American) showed up, but they told the instructor they might not continue since there was no stipend to cover expenses incurred, such as, transportation and lunch costs. On the second day of classes only three individuals came and the project training contractor convinced stipends were essential requested permission from the Department of Labor for use of stipends in the public ESL program.

Stipends were authorized by Friday of the first week and on Saturday the project staff once again notified the 60 workers about the program and told them that stipends would now be paid. On the following Monday, 44 people attended class, on Tuesday about 75 and on Wednesday about 110. By the end of the week attendance was more than twice the number initially contacted, with no sign of a let-up in the coming weeks. The vast majority of those attending the public ESL courses were Chinese-Americans; of the 110 enrollees, only 4 or 5 were from other ethnic groups. A member of the Chinese-American community stated that the information about the stipends had been spread among cannery workers by "the Chinese-American grapevine." The turnout exceeded the funds available to provide stipends and so only the top 75 in terms of seniority in the canneries were covered. As a consequence only about six enrollees remained in the program without stipends, with 30 or more dropping out. When stipends were discontinued altogether in April of 1974, attendance dropped to approximately 20% of the original stipend-supported enrollment.

As a comparison, a similar public school ESL program in San Jose, with mostly Mexican-American enrollees, offered no stipend, yet was able to attract cannery workers and retain them in the program at acceptable attendance levels.

A number of cultural factors which we don't fully understand were undoubtedly at work in shaping the Chinese-American response to the training. One manifestation of this culture or at least its economic practices appears to have had a special impact in limiting the opportunities of the Chinese-Americans for advancement in the canneries. This limiting factor is the unusually extensive use of car pools. The following trainee story using a fictional name is illustrative.

> S. U. Wu was born and educated in Canton, China, and came to Sacramento, California, with her family after first entering Canada, migrating to San Francisco, and then going into the Central Valley. During the canning season, she and four other Chinese-American

women hire a young Chinese man to drive them in a car pool to a plant near Davis, about 14 miles away. Mrs. Wu wanted to advance to the higher paying job of can filler operator, but those jobs started and ended an hour later than the sorting jobs she and her car pool friends held so she remained in the lower paying job since she would have to leave the car pool and couldn't afford transportation by herself.

Because the training staff and personnel officers in some of the plants had brought the car pool phenomenon to our attention, we collected data on the mode of travel to work in our follow-up interviews. The results as presented in Tables 11 and 12 below show the sharp differences between the Chinese-Americans and the other trainees. Most striking is that all but one of the Chinese-Americans used a car pool and half of their car pools involved six or more people.

Table 11

MODE OF TRAVEL TO WORK
FIRST YEAR CANNERY TRAINEES

Mode of Transportation	Chin-Am ESL (n=23)	Mex-Am ESL (n=24)	Mex-Am BE (n=19)	Black ARC (n=25)
Car Pool	96%	41%	21%	68%
Drives Self Only	-	29%	58%	24%
Family Member Drives	4%	13%	11%	-
Bus	-	4%	5%	8%
Walks	-	13%	5%	-

Table 12

NUMBER IN CAR POOLS FOR
FIRST YEAR CANNERY TRAINEES

Number in Car Pools	Chin-Am ESL (n=23)	Mex-Am ESL (n=24)	Mex-Am BE (n=19)	Black ARC (n=25)
Two	-	17%	-	32%
Three	17%	8%	-	32%
Four	17%	4%	5%	4%
Five	13%	4%	11%	-
Six or More	49%	8%	5%	-
Not in Car Pool	4%	59%	79%	32%

The effect of the unique Chinese-American car pool patterns were emphasized by an interview finding that 70 per cent of the Chinese-Americans felt that if one of the car pool members got a job which started and stopped an hour before or after their fellow workers in the car pool then that worker would have to drop out of the car pool.

Assessment

The question of whether the program increased the advancement rate of the trainees over the experience they would have had if there had been no program is the overall evaluation criterion. If there was any measurable impact at all we wanted to be able to answer two questions: (1) Was the impact sufficient to provide a positive social return or benefit compared to the cost? (2) Did the program make a significant contribution to the affirmative action objectives?

To get data for this analysis we took two steps. First, a control group was created matched to a stratified random sample of the trainees. Second, the change in earnings of the trainees and the control group were compared between the year prior to training (1972) and the year after training (1973).

The trainee and control groups were matched using the annual seniority lists published by each canning plant. The lists permitted us to match the trainees and the controls on four

variables: Plant location, seniority level, ethnic group (divided into Chinese, Spanish, and "other" surname categories) and sex. After the earnings data were obtained we also controlled for income itself, eliminating the few matched pairs where annual income in the pre-training year differed by $1,000 or more. Appendix A presents more detail on the sample design as well as the statistical analysis.

Net Impact of the Training

It was important to begin by asking whether there was any impact at all from the program because it was the first year of an experimental project. Some positive results, even though modest, could be important in further experimentation with the layoff time training concept. We begin then with a look at the results of the earnings analysis.

The net increase in earnings of the trainees compared to the control group was $102. From a 1972 base for both groups of $1,531 the trainees went to $1,899 and the control group to $1,797. In terms of statistical significance the differential gain for the trainees could have occurred by chance alone about one out of five times.

In most statistical analyses, one would conclude there is no statistically significant difference between the earnings of the two groups. Hence it would be reasonable to agree the program probably did not have a measurable impact.

However, a big "but" must be added, and that is, "but, the $102 is important in terms of cannery earnings." Indeed it represents a 5.7 per cent increase in pay over the controls. Moreover, in terms important to the program, it equals the increase in earnings which would occur if about 2/3's of the trainees advanced one pay bracket beyond the control group, although remaining in the seasonal worker category. We know, of course, that only about 30 per cent of the trainees actually advanced one or more pay brackets so that the $102 net increase in earnings must be attributed to a combination of more than one bracket increase and more hours worked by some of the trainees in comparison with the control group.

Our judgment is that the $102 increase in earnings is significant in terms of the substance of the program. Notwithstanding the statistical qualifications, we conclude that the program had an impact which, although small, was consistent with its operational success and was sufficient to warrant the continued development of the project.

As with the bidding and advancement results, there were marked differences among the subgroups of trainees. First, the men who took training benefited more compared to their control group than did the women: the net increase for men was $198 compared to $89 for the women. It should be noted that women in both the trainee and control groups advanced at a higher rate than the men. The men in both groups continued to have an absolute advantage in earnings over the women, but among the control groups, the women closed the earning gap by $167. This overall enhancement of the women, particularly in the control group, may reflect the affirmative action efforts in the plants to upgrade women. Table 13 compares the earnings experience for trainee and control group men and women.

Table 13

OVERALL EARNINGS FOR FIRST YEAR
CANNERY TRAINEES VS. CONTROL GROUP

Study Groups	Total Earnings 1972	Total Earnings 1973		Net Change 1972 to 1973		Net Difference '72 to '73
		Trainees	Controls	Trainees	Controls	
Total	$1,531	$1,899	$1,797	$368	$266	$102
Women	1,450	1,825	1,736	375	286	89
Men	2,110	2,427	2,229	317	119	198
Difference between Women and Men	660	602	493	58	167	

The earnings analysis confirms our earlier findings about the Chinese-Americans (see Table 14) except that the trainees even appear to have lost ground compared to their control group. The net difference in earnings between the two groups was -$47.

The Mexican-Americans faired the best with a net gain of $156. The "other" category, consisting of 73 per cent Black workers, had a net gain of $81. As was the case with the analysis of gains of women vs. men, the "other" group started well behind the Mexican and even the Chinese-American workers in pre-program earnings, but both the "other" trainee and control groups made greater gains. This result may be due to the fact that 71 per cent of the "other" category consists of workers from Oakland where the canning season is more specialized and shorter than in the Central Valley, hence, one would expect

the base incomes to be lower. Additionally, our plant personnel officer and union business agent interviews, to be reported in a subsequent section, gave us the impression that there was more active bidding by all workers in the Oakland plants than elsewhere. This may explain why both trainee and control groups in the "other" category made relatively large gains, producing a smaller overall net difference between the two. If our supposition is correct that higher proportions of workers bid in Oakland, it suggests the possibility that the net effects of the training may be relatively short lived, especially the counseling and information about bidding and jobs.

One of the personnel officers in Oakland did tell us about seeing some of the trainees helping other workers to put in bids. These "spillover" effects may have been picked up in our control group matching procedure which involved picking the name of the worker nearest on the seniority list who had not attended training and who had the same surname category and sex. Especially in Oakland, where about 60 per cent of the trainees were between 46 and 55 years of age and had 21 years of seasonal seniority or more, we undoubtedly selected many workers for the control group who were old friends and working mates of the trainees, with whom the trainees would gladly share their new knowledge. Such a selection procedure undoubtedly permitted contamination of the results, but in the rough and tumble of applied experimentation this is simply an occupational hazard. Moreover, from the canneries' point of view, their purpose in participating was not to engage in an experiment for the sake of gathering research data, but to see if they could find some ways to enhance the job role of women and minorities.

Table 14 below, presents the earnings experienced by ethnic groups.

Table 14

EARNINGS OF ETHNIC GROUPS AMONG FIRST YEAR CANNERY TRAINEES

Study Groups	Total Earnings 1972	Total Earnings 1973		Net Change 1972 to 1973		Net Difference '72 to '73
		Trainees	Controls	Trainees	Controls	
Mexican-Am.	$1,689	$2,067	$1,911	$378	$222	$156
Chinese-Am.	1,709	1,797	1,844	88	135	47
Other	1,253	1,700	1,619	447	366	81

The differences between the program segments or components are fairly sizable. However the predominant racial groups and geographical locations inherent in the components probably explain much of the differences. For example, the Chinese-Americans were mostly in ESL and in that component they experienced a loss compared to their controls of $38. The Mexican-Americans in ESL had a net gain of $61. Even so, the ESL results remain well below the net gains for ARC ($104) and basic education ($224). The basic education result comes as a surprise because, as reported earlier, it was the component least focused on employment objectives.

The most impressive gain came to the Mexican-Americans who attended the ARC course. They experienced a net gain of $414 over their control group. The "others" who attended ARC had a net gain of only $53. Underlying this result is the fact that 84 per cent of these trainees came from Oakland where the control group experienced the greatest gain between 1972 and 1973 of any of the control group.

The ARC results add further weight to our theory that there may have been substantial spillover effects from the training in Oakland. Eighty-four per cent of the "other" ARC trainees came from Oakland and consisted of 107 trainees from 5 plants. By contrast, half of the Mexican-American ARC trainees came from Modesto where there were only 35 total trainees in ARC drawn from about 12 plants, several of which are comparatively large, and most have far younger work forces. The chances are that there was far less possibility of contamination among the Mexican-American group by having the trainees share their knowledge among associates in the control group. We therefore conclude that the Mexican-American ARC results are more nearly an accurate reflection of the net impact of that component than is the result for the "other" category.

Table 15, on the next page, presents the earnings results by training component and ethnic groups.

Table 15

EARNINGS WITHIN TRAINING COMPONENTS
FOR FIRST YEAR CANNERY TRAINEES

Study Groups	Total Earnings 1972	Total Earnings 1973		Net Change 1972 to 1973		Net Difference '72 to '73
		Trainees	Controls	Trainees	Controls	
ESL	$1,729	$1,964	$1,936	$235	$207	$ 28
ESL Mex-Am	1,762	2,069	2,008	307	246	61
ESL Ch-Am	1,663	1,754	1,788	91	125	-38
Basic Educ.	1,657	2,084	1,888	427	231	224
BE Mex-Am	1,591	2,023	1,822	432	231	201
BE Ch-Am	2,122	2,180	2,316	58	194	-136
BE Other	1,696	2,188	1,937	492	241	251
ARC	1,242	1,695	1,591	453	349	104
ARC Mex-Am	1,619	2,151	1,737	532	118	414
ARC Other	1,179	1,619	1,566	440	387	53

Our general conclusion, already stated, is that the program had a small but measurable impact overall. The secondary conclusions are that the program had no impact at all on the Chinese-American trainees in ways consistent with the goals of the project. Finally, the most substantial benefit accrued to the Mexican-Americans who participated in the ARC program.

Cost-Benefit Analysis

A standard measure of program effectiveness is the classic cost-benefit ratio. This criterion approaches the problem from the government's point of view and measures benefits in terms of national economic accounting concepts. The primary benefit measure is the net increase in earnings which is assumed to measure the increase in productivity resulting from the program. The underlying assumption is that those who would have gotten the jobs which the trainees obtain soon find employment elsewhere at the same or a higher wage rate. Hence, there is assumed to be no displacement or loss in net productivity. We will present the cost-benefit data in the classic framework

and then will examine the special qualifications about using it in the cannery affirmative action context.

The benefits are calculated by adding the cumulative net increases in income which the trainees are expected to receive over the years from the continuing effects of the training program. This "stream of benefits", as it is called, is discounted to bring it to its current value so that it is directly comparable to costs actually incurred.

In most manpower training cost-benefit studies, the period over which benefits are expected to be received is assumed to be a working life of 20 years. Our judgment, however, is that conditions change so rapidly that the net effects are likely to disappear more quickly. We think that this is especially likely in the cannery situation. As a result, we have adopted a 5 year benefit period for ESL and basic education programs. For ARC we have adopted a 2 year benefit period on the grounds that these benefits are likely to be especially transitory as the firms encourage all of the workers to use the bidding system. Indeed, one of the principal industry officials told us that he expected training and information about jobs and bidding would reach the saturation point in three or four years.

The other major ingredient is the discount rate which is variously set between 6 per cent and about 18 per cent. We have adopted a conservative 10 per cent rate which is close to the government interest rates experienced during the project.

Table 16, on the following page, presents program costs and benefits. We have excluded the results for the Chinese-Americans because it is already clear that there was a loss on the training investment as measured by increased income.

Table 16

COST-BENEFIT RESULTS FOR
FIRST YEAR CANNERY TRAINEES

Program	Cost Per Trainee	Benefit Period	Discounted Benefits	Ratio of Benefits To Costs
ESL Mexican-Am	$983	5 yrs.	$ 254	.26
Basic Education	983	5 yrs.	934	.95
Mexican-Am	983	5 yrs.	838	.85
Other	983	5 yrs.	1,047	1.06
ARC	170	2 yrs.	199	1.17
Mexican-Am	170	2 yrs.	790	4.65
Other	170	2 yrs.	101	.59

The results appear to lead to these conclusions: (1) ESL produced little benefit in relation to the cost. Even if more liberal assumptions are used (6 per cent discount rate and 20 year benefit period) the benefit does not equal the cost. (2) Basic education produced benefits approximately equal to the costs. If any of the very conservative assumptions we made are relaxed, basic education would produce a positive return on the investment. For example, if we had used a 6 per cent discount rate, the final basic education benefit/cost ratio overall would have been 1.04. With a 6 per cent discount rate and a 10 year benefit period, the benefit/cost ratio would have been 1.81. (3) ARC produced a striking return for the Mexican-American group and a positive return overall, even with the very restrictive 2 year benefit period. The results for the "Other" group in ARC were not positive, but if we relaxed the assumed benefit period to 5 years, there would be a benefit/cost ratio of 1.3.

The general conclusions following the cost-benefit analysis would be that further investment in ESL, unless marked improvements could be made, would not be justified. Basic education indicated promising results and the ARC seems likely, especially in certain areas, to be immensely productive, partly because of its low cost.

Cost-benefit analysis in the cannery project needs to be qualified in several respects. First of all, we would re-emphasize that the cost-benefit framework as we have presented it is primarily the government's criterion. Businesses, for example, in their engineering and systems studies, measure benefits as direct increases in production made possible by the program incurring the cost. The government's concept of benefit and business's concept do come together when the government program relieves a direct production problem, such as a critical skill shortage. But when workers enter an industry or advance within the industry without relieving any direct production problem, then the industry is indifferent since from their viewpoint, (and this is consistent with the government's assumptions) they could have easily hired someone else with the same skills at the same wage rate.

Even in the government's terms, the benefits measured as increased income will be entirely offset by equal losses in income by those who did not get the jobs when the advancement occurs in a tightly closed internal labor market. As Doeringer and Piore[5] point out, advancement within an internal labor market is a "zero-sum game."

In the canning industry, the internal labor market was not nearly as highly developed at the time of the first year of training as in other industries such as those involved in the LOTT project in the Antioch-Pittsburg area. In the canneries, many workers are hired each season from the outside into jobs at nearly all pay levels and at least some of the women and minority men who advanced as a result of the training program probably filled jobs which would have been filled by outside workers. As a result, there were probably some productivity gains as measured in national economic accounting, but they were not large. It is important in the cannery case to note that the problems of sex discrimination result precisely because there is open entry which routinely permits men to enter at the higher paid jobs.

The final point is that the goal of the program from the industry and union point of view was not increased economic efficiency, although this was clearly desired, but rather the goal was to equalize employment opportunities for women and minority men. The intended benefit in these terms is greater equity in work opportunities and income distribution. Our use of net increase in income as a benefit is therefore a reasonably good approximation of the increase in equity achieved as a result of the program.

---

[5]Op. Cit.

Affirmative Action Gains

The final criterion which we will examine lies in the question, did the program contribute to the industry and union affirmative action objectives? Although the positive return in portions of the training suggests that there were some gains by women and minority men, they were obviously small, except for Mexican-Americans in ARC. But the affirmative action question really asks whether "sufficient" progress was made as a result of the training to begin to alter the basic composition of the work force, especially in the higher bracketed jobs.

There was no established measure of whether the program was making a "sufficient" contribution, especially because the EEOC deliberations which would eventually define adequate equal employment progress had not progressed far. In the absence of a clear guide, we decided that the proportion of women among new "regular" workers - that is those who work 1400 hours or more per year - is a good indicator of affirmative action progress. If women are getting an adequate share of the regular positions, then they are undoubtedly getting an adequate share of the better paying seasonal jobs. And the reverse proposition probably also holds true.

Our examination of the proportion of women among new regulars in 22 of the largest plants indicated that on the 1973 lists, which covered the year before the program, women obtained 20 per cent of the new regular jobs. This figure produces an estimate that on the average 24 women made regular in these plants. Although the decision is rather arbitrary, we decided that an increase of 5 per cent in the proportion of women who made regular would constitute a beginning, although very modest, contribution toward affirmative action goals.

For the 16 plants which participated in the first year cannery training program, the 5 per cent increase in the proportion of women among new regulars would require that about 16 women trainees make regular, or, on the average, one per plant. We examined our income analysis data, using a base income level of $4,900 as an indication that a trainee had made regular. None earned this amount of money, which was calculated by multiplying the lowest wage times 1400 hours. Since we were working with a sample of the trainees and a control group, it is possible that there were a small number who made regular, but who were not in the sample. Indeed, we know of one such case. As a result, we conclude that not more than 2 or 3 of the trainees made regular, and this is far below the 16 needed to meet our affirmative action progress criteria.

The overall conclusion about the impact of the first year cannery training program in equalizing employment opportunities for women is that it had little or no effect.

Employer and Union Views

In the Winter of 1974 we interviewed 15 canning company Industrial Relations Directors and plant Personnel Officers and 11 Teamster Cannery Council Secretary-Treasurers and Business Agents to gain their perceptions of the program and its place in the industry. The interviews were conducted well before the client interview and earnings data were available. The responses therefore represent impressions gained from observing or participating in training activities and, for some of those interviewed, also from being members of the program's joint policy committee. Since the Joint Committee received regular briefings from the training contractor, the views of those on the committee undoubtedly in some degree also reflected the information provided in those briefings.

Manpower Problems

The Center's experience in assessing training programs has led us to expect that employers will assess a program in terms of its impact on their operational manpower problems. If the program addresses production problems stemming, for example, from a skill shortage, then they are likely to have favorable views. Conversely, if the program does not address an operational manpower problem, they are more likely to have negative or indifferent views of the program. We therefore opened our interviews by asking about manpower problems as the company and union officials saw them.

Two problems were consistently mentioned, neither of which was the object of the first year layoff time training program. The first problem, one seen as quite pressing in many plants, was filling semi-skilled equipment operator jobs such as lift truck driver and can labeling machine operator. Both jobs, and a few more, were subject to high turnover and required more training than could be provided easily on-the-job by first line supervisors during the hectic pace of the canning season.

Prior to the layoff time training experiment, there was little organized training in the industry, and plants were having difficulty filling openings in the semi-skilled jobs. With pressure being exerted on the industry and union to advance women into higher paying jobs, including particularly the equipment operator jobs, the inadequacies of the customary

informal on-the-job training during the season had become quite apparent to those we interviewed.

The second manpower problem consistently mentioned was difficulty in filling vacancies in skilled mechanical and electrical jobs such as seamer mechanic. Part of the problem stemmed from the restrictions imposed by the evolving seniority system. The general rule adopted in the 1973 collective bargaining agreement was that a specialized worker, not on the seniority list, could be hired during the canning season, but that worker could not be kept on the payroll unless he continued to work in his speciality. Because the work force drops 60 to 80 per cent after the canning season is over and the remaining workers often perform a variety of jobs outside of their seasonal specialities, many specialists hired from the outside were laid off like the other seasonal workers.

A related part of the problem of hiring skilled workers during the season is that those who apply and are hired are often poorly qualified; the better qualified workers go directly to permanent jobs in other industries. Additionally, the noisy, high pressure working conditions in the canneries, plus lower wage levels than are paid for comparable skills in other industries, especially in urban areas, contributed to recruiting problems and high turnover in the skilled jobs. Although the relative wages appear to have been rising, in 1970 the canning industry paid wages which were only 70 per cent of the average wage in U.S. industry.

The industry had made one attempt prior to the experimental project to provide an industry-wide approach to training to meet its skilled worker needs. Since 1970 the labor-management contract provided for on-the-job training of mechanics, but the training provisions had not met the overall industry needs. A few companies used the training provisions to meet at least a portion of their skilled worker needs. Other companies had no success at all with on-the-job skill training program, partly because of the failure of their workers to pass the required aptitude test. One of the hopes expressed by many was that the experimental project would assist these workers to pass the aptitude test.

Expected Benefits of the Training Program

The fundamental concern of the industry and union in participating in the program was to increase opportunities for women and minorities. Since 1971 pressure had increased for the industry and union to rectify the imbalance of minority men in the highest paying job brackets and for women in all

of the job brackets above the very lowest. Indeed it had only been since 1970 that dual pay and job structures for men and women were eliminated. The industry and union hoped that the experimental training program would satisfy the recommendation by the State Fair Employment Practices Commission in March 1972 to develop "innovative approaches that will obtain parity for minority employees throughout the total job structure.[6]

The primary benefit expected from the program was that it would help facilitate the advancement of women and minority group members and thereby mitigate the eventual costs of a conciliation agreement between the industry and union and the Federal Equal Employment Opportunities Commission (EEOC) in response to several suits filed by minority groups.

While there was agreement among those interviewed that the program was expected to help women and minorities, the fact that it didn't deal directly with the skill training problems produced divided opinions about the merits of the program as it operated in the first year. There were two main bodies of thought about the program's value although the views of few individuals fit entirely in one or another group.

One view was that equalizing opportunities for women, the main affirmative action problem in the industry, could help the manpower problems facing the industry. The view was that the women with extensive seasonal seniority represented a stable, trainable work force which could move into the semi-skilled and eventually the skilled jobs and improve the overall quality of the cannery work force. According to this view, getting the women to advance required an initial concentration on language training, since many are Mexican-Americans with limited English skills, and also training on the content of cannery jobs, the work rules and the advancement procedures. The women were viewed by many as lacking the self-confidence to use the knowledge which they possess and the training was therefore expected to build their self-confidence and assertiveness. The training program with its ESL and ARC components was seen as dealing with the prerequisites for advancement.

The second view was that training, especially if it was to involve industry-union negotiated funds, should concentrate directly on the problems of filling vacancies in the semi-skilled

---

[6]California, Department of Industrial Relations, Fair Employment Practices Commission, March, 1972, p. 3.

and skilled jobs. While acknowledging that many women do lack language skills and the knowledge to use the system of bidding for advancement, the view was that ESL ought to be taught in the public schools, not in the canneries, and training for advancement should be limited to providing the information necessary for those who already have the desire and self-confidence to move up.

Impact of the Experimental Program

We judge that some of the differences among industry and union observers about the value of the program as it operated in the first year stemmed from the difficulty of gauging the impact of the program in the canneries during the 1973 canning season. The program had served only about 400 workers from 15 canneries which had a total of between 12,000 and 15,000 workers on seasonal seniority lists. In some plants as few as five to ten workers were trained out of peak seasonal work forces averaging 1,200 to 1,500 and it was therefore difficult to judge the program's impact.

Many people we interviewed could point to individuals they knew who took training and might, for example, have spoken to them in English for the first time, or who might have gotten or failed to get a better job. But in only two plants, both in Oakland, were the number of workers in the training program large enough (50 to 60 per plant) so that the impact of the training was noticeable in the life of the plant.

The personnel managers in the two plants with relatively large numbers of trainees saw several positive effects of the training.

1. **The classroom** training gave the personnel managers an opportunity to discuss and explain company policies to a degree which had never before been possible. These personnel managers, like those from other plants and union officials, participated in the training sessions. The participation took the form of discussing work and advancement rules, guiding plants tours and playing roles in mock registration and bidding procedures. The result for the plants, in the view of the personnel managers, was improved working relationships between the workers and the personnel officers.

2. A second positive effect of the training in the two plants was increased interest in the job bidding process with the trainees using the system more than other workers and encouraging others to take advantage of the opportunities. One of the personnel managers commented that there were a sufficient number of trainees on each of the three shifts to make a noticeable difference in the level of interest in bidding on every shift and also more general interest in and awareness of other company policies.

Program Problems

The union and industry representatives were asked whether they saw problems in the program. Those interviewed had generally favorable views of the program, but did see problems.

Once concern, widely shared, was with the lack of service for the most senior employees. Part of this problem was inherent in the program in that it was designed only to serve seasonal employees on layoff and therefore could not serve some of the very senior year-round "regular" workers who had been unable to advance. All of those we interviewed recognized these limitations were built into the design of the LOTT experiment, but many continued to hope that it would serve at least some of these regular employees in the future.

A variation on this problem assessment was the view that the program had taken a "shot-gun" approach, attracting low seniority employees with little chance for promotion as well as high seniority employees with good chances for promotion. Two influential industry representatives felt that the second year program should concentrate on recruiting high seniority workers. Both said that they wanted the program to have a high success rate (measured by advancement) serving a smaller number of workers rather than a low success rate serving a large number of workers.

Another variation on this problem which concerned several of those we interviewed was the difficulty of attracting senior men who were eligible for the program. The Mexican-American men were of special concern. A number of those we interviewed believed too few had signed up and that too large a proportion of these had dropped out. Many ideas were advanced to explain low involvement by Mexican-American men including the idea of "Machismo" which suggests the men were reluctant to attend classes and compete with women.

Another hypothesis to explain low involvement by Mexican-American men is that some of the men who needed basic education and English language training were afraid to sign up because that would be an admission to the companies and their fellow workers that they really couldn't speak English adequately or handle mathematical or reading problems. One personnel officer said he knew Mexican-American men who felt lucky to have a job and feared that they would be fired if the company knew about their educational inadequacies.

The most troublesome problems for the program in the eyes of those we interviewed involved its position outside the formal collective bargaining structure and the established grievance procedures. In the design of the program, the training contractor as a neutral third party was responsible for teaching workers how to use the job advancement procedures agreed to by the union and the industry through collective bargaining. Understandably this role is difficult to fulfill and most certainly may not always be so perceived by all parties. For example, in one area union officials became upset when the trainer, in their view, became a grievance advocate. Others on the union side worried over the possibility the training would be viewed as a benefit given by the employer. There was some fear too that trainers might erode the identity of the workers and the union. On the company side there was the sometimes difficult discovery that interpretations of the contract and practices as described by a company official in class were different from those experienced by workers from other companies or even different plants of the same company. Yet these various strains of the relationship never became serious enough to threaten the program's continuance. This was true, in part, because many recognized bidding was a new concept that came with the 1970 Contract. Workers on the whole were barely conscious of the existence when training started. Training was therefore seen as a vehicle for making a new and to most seasonals, strange new system work.

Conclusions from the First Year Cannery LOTT Program

The objective of the first year cannery layoff time training program was to demonstrate that non-skills training (basic education, literacy training and work orientation) could be useful when focused on a specific industry meeting the following criteria:

- Specific skill qualifications were required for advancement in addition to seniority.

- Hiring was permitted from outside the existing work force at all wage levels.

- Large numbers of senior workers were passed over for advancement apparently because of problems which non-skills training could rectify.

- Passed over workers experienced extended periods of layoff, but were assured of recall to work and the layoff could be used for training purposes.

- There was strong employer and union support for the program.

Two conclusions are appropirate under the objective, the first being:

1. The project demonstrated that a non-skills LOTT program could be operated in an industry such as canning which met the criteria.

The basis for the conclusion is:

a. More target group workers than were needed applied for training.

b. Target group workers were encouraged to participate by employers and the union.

c. Learning occurred at rates usually considered acceptable for such a program.

d. Bidding for higher level jobs increased about 100 per cent beyond what would have been expected in the absence of the training.

e. A high proportion of those who bid for jobs requiring jobs trials received them (84 per cent) and an equally high proportion of those who received a job trial passed (86 per cent).

f. Thirty per cent of the trainees advanced one pay bracket or more.

g. The trainees income increased more than that of a matched control group. ($102 net increase in income for the season equaling a 5.7 per cent net gain.) Among trainee groups, the range extended from a small loss for Chinese-Americans to a 24 per cent net increase for Mexican-Americans who participated in the Advancement Related Counseling (ARC) course.

The second conclusion is:

2. The benefits of non-skills training (particularly basic education and English-as-a-Second Language) are too indirect and too uncertain to retain long term employer-union support. Employers and unions will prefer training which is directed toward operational manpower problems which in most cases will involve skill training. The benefits of non-skills training are more consistent with traditional public school adult basic education benefits and the training will have to be provided in that setting.

The basis for this conclusion is:

a. Using conservative assumptions (5 year benefit period for ESL and basic education and 2 years for Advancement Related Counseling, a 10 per cent discount rate, and benefits measured solely as increased earnings), ESL returned only about one quarter of the cost (benefit to cost ratio of .26), basic education approximately broke even (benefit to cost ratio of .95) and Advancement Related Counseling produced a small, but meaningful, net gain (benefit cost ratio of 1.17). If one assumes, as we do, that the increase in income is a reasonable measure of gain in the equity on behalf of women and minority men, then only the Advancement Related Counseling produced a positive return on the investment toward affirmative action objectives.

b. Using an alternative measure of progress toward affirmative action objectives (five per cent increase in the proportion of women who made "regular" status), the project did not make a material contribution to the affirmative action objectives.

Overall the first year of cannery training demonstrated that layoff time could be used for training. As increasingly specific needs of the industry were identified courses were modified to meet these needs, including addition of the separate Advancement Related Counseling.

Important lessons learned in the first year were:

1. Even within a single industry there will be considerable differences in needs from area to area and company to company. Many of these stem from differences in the surrounding labor market. A program design should allow flexibility so adjustments to fit variations in needs can be made.

2. It was possible to develop and maintain a reasonable experimental design so that effective evaluation could be conducted. This was possible even though the program underwent important changes during the year of operation. Conducting the experimental design evaluation was made possible by continuing dialogue and consultation between the training contractor and the evaluation contractor.

3. Information and counseling emerged as a critical program element in this project just as it had in the prior Antioch-Pittsburg project. In spite of many years of work in the canning industry, many trainees had only a rudimentary knowledge of the jobs, the bidding and advancement processes, and the work rules. Moreover, it became clear that the affirmative action problem required changes in some basic social and cultural norms; the women, as much as the men, had to learn to accept new work roles.

4. The project served as an effective catalyst for development of training programs for cannery workers in public school adult education programs.

5. A third party can provide training which involves the work rules in the two party labor-management environment. Some stress is probably unavoidable, however.

Consensus for the Second Year Program

In terms of the dynamics of program development it is important to remember the industry and the union began with the DOL model. Many were dubious from the beginning as to the merits of non-skill training but went along since DOL was paying the costs. By the time planning for the second year was underway there was more understanding of both the program design and the specific needs of the parties.

While there was no uniform view about the value of the program, there was a consensus about the program elements for 1974.

1. Basic education as taught in 1973 was not needed for most cannery jobs and should be eliminated from the program. Some form of basic education might be needed in conjunction with a skills training program, but in that event a program tailored to the specific need should be developed at a later date.

2. A program which would train workers on selected pieces of cannery equipment where high turnover and high training costs are experienced should be instituted. Such a program, called Job Proficiency Training (JPT), was developed for the 1974 program involving training in operation of lift truck, can labeling lines, seamers and empty can depalletizers.

3. A program should be designed to replace the existing on-the-job training policy for mechanic positions and provide some form of industry-wide skills training.

4. While English-as-a-Second Language would be a part of the second year program, a concerted effort should be made to encourage the public schools to provide ESL for cannery workers.

5. Advancement Related Counseling should be continued as a major component of the 1974 program.

If LOTT is viewed as including non-skills training such as basic education and ESL then it was not accepted by the parties. The parties, particularly the industry, were too impatient for immediate results to wait for a possible long term payoff from non-skills training. In fact to the extent any of this continued it was only because the DOL remained as a financial partner and its funds were used for this purpose. The workers, for their part, continued to participate in ESL and thereby expressed a belief in its value.

CHAPTER III

TRAINING LAID OFF CANNERY WORKERS: THE SECOND YEAR

The Affirmative Action Cannery Training Program

The pressures on the canning industry and union to solve their affirmative action problems increased in the Spring of 1973. The California Fair Employment Practices Commission (FEPC) conducted its second review of the minority employment situation and additional suits were filed by minority organizations. Even though the first year results had not been dramatic, the training program offered a hopeful strategy to resolve the affirmative action problems and minimize the potential costs to the union and employers. To establish training as its primary equal employment opportunity response, the California Processors, Inc., (CPI), agreed in the 1973 Collective Bargaining Agreement to pay 1¢ per hour for what came to be called the Affirmative Action Cannery Training Program. The agreement further stated that the employer contribution would be increased to 3¢ per hour if the Federal Equal Employment Opportunities Commission (EEOC) would accept the training program as full settlement of all existing and related class action suits and complaints.

Neither the EEOC, nor the complaining parties, agreed to a settlement at that point so the second year of training was planned with an industry contributed budget of $250,000-$300,000, or about half the amount thought necessary to operate a minimally adequate program. To finance the additional training, the Joint Committee sought a matching grant from the Department of Labor, Office of Research and Development. DOL agreed to provide the funds with the understanding that it was making a one year contribution to assist in the "transition" from an experimental and demonstration project to a permanent industry supported program.

We have already described the consensus which developed for the second year program. It is important to add that the consensus, coupled with the nature of the affirmative action pressures, produced important changes in the program's objectives. Where the first year objective had been to test whether a non-skills LOTT program could be effectively operated, the second year objective was unambiguous affirmative action: to improve the employment status of women and minority men. It seemed clear that there was a strong congruence between meeting the affirmative action objective and meeting the employment needs of the industry in the semi-skilled and skilled jobs. As a result, the program shifted from non-skills training to an emphasis on skills training.

The change in the overall objective implied changes in the operational objectives: the program shifted from a pilot project to a large scale operational program. The magnitude of the shift

is represented in the addition of two cities (Stockton and San Jose) and an increase from 15 plants to 52. Also, where the pilot project trained 409 workers, the second year program eventually served 1,429.

The heart of the second year program was a new component called Job Proficiency Training (JPT) designed for semi-skilled jobs. The jobs were selected after a plant by plant survey by the training contractor to identify those jobs where substantial turnover existed and the tasks were sufficiently complex to warrant training. Implicit in the selection was the criteria that they should offer substantial promotional opportunities for women. The jobs selected were operating the casing machine, de-palletizer, seamer, label machine and lift truck.

JPT training was not expected to produce qualified workers. All trainees, consistent with contract conditions and local plant practices, would have to pass a job trial to fully qualify for the jobs. There were no uniform policies within the industry about whether, or how, the training was to be considered by the plants in the process of selection for job trials.

To make the JPT training as relevant as possible, it was offered in most cases in the workers' own plants.

Finally JPT was constrained to those jobs which could be performed during the off-season. The advantage of this is that by definition these jobs are the most likely to offer year around work and create a maximum opportunity for the women in gaining "regular" worker status. Except for the seamer, which seals lids on the cans, the jobs are all found in the warehouses which typically operate year around.

The disadvantage of training only for year around jobs is that the women would not be introduced to the many strictly seasonal jobs in the higher pay brackets. These seasonal jobs, in fact, posed a dilemma because as already pointed out in the discussion of the industry manpower problems it is difficult to train in the canneries during the rush and pressure of the canning season. Moreover there is a clear preference by some women for seasonal work. The effect of both factors, then, was to reduce the prospects for parity.

Following are the other main elements of the second year program:

- Each of the 52 canning plants in and around the cities of Sacramento, Stockton, Modesto, San Jose, Hayward and Oakland were offered a proportional share of the training slots according to plant size.

- Publicity was offered in the plants toward the end of the 1973 season. Individual interviews providing information about training were held with many of the more senior cannery employees. Employees were then permitted, and in some cases encouraged, to apply for training and subsequently to bid for higher paying jobs.

- In keeping with the evolving seniority system in the canning industry, the most senior workers were given priority for the training opportunities.

- A stipend of $2.50 was paid to cover training related expenses such as transportation and baby-sitting.

- No criteria were imposed to limit participation except relative seniority. Hence workers could go or not go to training for whatever reasons might motivate them. They were not, for example, required to bid in advance for the jobs for which they were to be trained.

The Second Year Results: Job Proficiency Training

Several considerations shaped the evaluation research for the second year cannery program. The most important of these is the fact that the program shifted from being an experimental project into being a large scale operational program. Experimental design evaluation which had been possible in the first year was not in the second. For example, the interviews by plant personnel managers served to divide seasonal workers into two distinct groups: those who decided they wanted the training and those who decided they didn't want it. Comparing results between the two is, of course, inappropriate.

Given the absence of an experimental design, the evaluation research could only use performance indicators and compare these between the programs and between the trainee's experience before and after training.

A second factor which shaped the evaluation research was a preliminary finding by the training contractor that only 53 per cent of the JPT participants bid for one of the jobs for which they were trained. Because the employers and the union were counting heavily on the training, especially the JPT program, to resolve their affirmative action problems, this preliminary finding was distressing. They therefore asked for a shift in the research from the planned second round of in-plant interviews and analysis of data from plant records to a set of follow-up interviews with

the trainees. Their major question was; "why a higher proportion did not bid for jobs for which they were trained?"

With this assignment from the Joint Committee, the Center for Applied Manpower Research (CAMR) developed two surveys. For the JPT component, CAMR designed a follow-up personal interview survey with a sample of 400 trainees of the approximately 750 participants. Since funds were limited, CAMR then designed a simpler plant record follow-up for the ESL and ARC trainees. As a consequence, we gained much more detailed data on the JPT program than on the other two.

We therefore believe it more effective to present the JPT results first and then the ESL-ARC results in a separate section. Because the preliminary data suggested there was a great deal of variation in bidding rates between plants, we structured the sample so that it would give a good representation both of plants where more bidding occurred and where less bidding occurred. We were able to complete interviews with 327 of the trainees, 82 per cent of the sample, and 44 per cent of all who went through JPT.

The survey questionnaire was designed to accomplish several things.

- We sought through it to clarify the bidding experience and understand what influenced bidding decisions. If trainees did not bid, why not? Was the company helpful in the bidding process? Were the trainees discouraged by anyone from bidding?

- Because job trials are the really critical test for the trainees we asked them about the experience. What were the attitudes of the foreman or supervisor and fellow workers? Were they helpful, or did they hinder the trainee in keeping the job? How helpful was the training in passing the job trial?

In the following material from the survey all percentage estimates are projected for the entire training group based upon the experience of the 44 per cent of the trainees we interviewed. The material is organized into sections on bidding, job trials and bracket movements.

Bidding

We have included in our analyses of bidding only those cases where the job being sought was a Bracket IV or higher bracket job for which a job trial is normally required. Those who said they bid for a Bracket V job such as "the belt," which happened on a few occasions, were not included. Also, we did not count incumbents on the jobs they said they had bid on.

Altogether 83 per cent of the trainees bid for a job which normally requires a job trial. In those plants which have open assignment on Bracket IV jobs, some of the trainees obtained those jobs without having bid. The 83 per cent estimate is therefore a reasonable estimate, and is slightly on the conservative side.

Also we identified those bids which were for jobs for which the person had received training in JPT. Fifty-seven per cent of the total trainees bid for at least one job for which they had been trained. Twenty-six per cent of the trainees bid for jobs which were outside their training experience.

Table 17 below, summarizes the overall bidding experience.

Table 17

PERCENTAGE OF JPT TRAINEES
BIDDING AND NOT BIDDING

Category	Yes, Did Bid Percent	No, Did NOT Bid Percent	Total
Bid for a Bracket IV or higher bracket job	83%	17%	100%
Bid for at least one job for which the person was trained in JPT	57%	43%	100%
Bid for a Bracket IV or higher bracket job other than a job for which the person was trained in JPT	26%		

289-748 O - 78 - 5

These results were more encouraging than the preliminary finding by the training contractor and the overall rate seems quite satisfactory. But in terms of efficiency, bidding on jobs for which one is trained, the 57 per cent rate is still low and was viewed as such by industry and union representatives.

The preliminary data on bidding for JPT jobs indicated that there was a great deal of variability from plant to plant. Because such a high overall average bidding rate was found in the survey (83 per cent), the plant rates are heavily weighted toward 80 to 100 per cent, although one plant had a bidding rate of 51 per cent. Table 18, below, presents the percentage distribution of bidding rates for the plants with the larger number of participants.

Table 18

PERCENTAGE OF JPT TRAINEES BIDDING FOR A JOB REQUIRING A JOB TRIAL IN THE PLANTS WITH THE MOST PARTICIPANTS*

Percent of JPT Trainees Bidding for Job Requiring a Job Trial	Number of Plants	Per cent of Plants
0 - 10%	-	0
11 - 20%	-	0
21 - 30%	-	0
31 - 40%	-	0
41 - 50%	-	0
51 - 60%	1	4.5%
61 - 70%	2	9.1%
71 - 80%	4	18.2%
81 - 90%	8	36.4%
91 - 100%	7	31.8%
Total	22	100.0%

Footnote:

*For the purpose of this table and the subsequent plant by plant analyses we restricted the count to those plants which had 10 or more JPT trainees, of whom we interviewed at least 6. This restriction minimizes sampling error by insuring that we had interviewed at least half the trainees in the plants with the fewest participants.

The most important result from asking why people did not bid for jobs for which they were trained was the finding that there were more than 16 discretely different explanations. Table 19 on the following page presents the responses. Only one response was offered by more than 10 per cent of the trainees, that being they just did not like the job (19 per cent). The jobs most frequently cited were in this order, forklift, label machine and caser. The wide number of answers made it difficult to pinpoint a simple solution to improving the program's efficiency in terms of trainees bidding for the job for which they were trained.

Table 19

REASONS JPT TRAINEES GAVE FOR NOT BIDDING ON JOBS FOR WHICH THEY RECEIVED TRAINING

	Reasons Given for Not Bidding on JPT Jobs	Per cent Giving the Reason
1.	Just did not like the job. For example, too scary, too messy, too much responsibility, or too heavy	19%
2.	Felt did not have enough seniority to bid	9%
3.	Did not get or finish the training. For example, called back to plant, got sick, or lost interest and dropped out	9%
4.	Not physically able to do the job due, for example, to illness, injury or overweight	9%
5.	Job for which trained was in the same or lower bracket as current job	8%
6.	Not enought training or experience for the job	7%
7.	Got other opportunity at Bracket III or higher job	5%
8.	No bid is required for the job in my plant	5%
9.	Job might lead to year-round work, which I don't want	4%
10.	Felt the job was a man's job	4%
11.	Feared loss of opportunities in current job if took another job	3%
12.	No job opportunities were posted in those jobs.	3%
13.	Was afraid of the supervisor or foreman	3%
14.	Did not feel secure, confident or capable of doing the job	3%
15.	Did not understand that I could or should bid for the job	2%
16.	Miscellaneous other responses, including no response	7%

As part of the effort to understand what impact, if any, plant practices might have on bidding rates, we asked the trainees what the company did to help them in bidding. Did the company provide information about the jobs, and if so, what kind? Did a company person help the trainees decide whether to bid and what to bid on? Did they explain bidding procedures? Did they do other things to help? Based upon the spontaneous responses by the trainees, the interviewers then helped the person to indicate a personal feeling about the company's attitude toward bidding. These company attitudes as seen by the trainees were marked in one of the four categories shown in Table 20 on the following page. The categories were designed as a graduated scale from an attitude which strongly encourage the person to bid to a negative attitude which made it difficult to bid.

As Table 20 shows, there were some distinctly different groupings. Considering the top two responses as favorable, 66 per cent of the trainees felt that their plants were helpful in the bidding process. Only 11 per cent gave the clearly negative response.

The major theory we were testing was that the plant attitude would determine whether people would bid or not. The distributions in the two columns covering those who did not bid and those who did bid make clear that the company attitudes as seen by the trainees had no significant effects on bidding.

Table 20

TRAINEES' PERCEPTION OF
THEIR COMPANY'S ATTITUDE
TOWARD BIDDING

Trainees' Perception	Per cent Who Did Not Bid	Per cent Who Bid on Job Requiring A Job Trial	Total Trainees
They seemed to want me to bid and were very helpful in explaining the bidding process and the jobs.	39%	35%	36%
They gave me information about bidding and the jobs, but left it up to me whether to bid or not. They didn't encourage me to bid.	26%	31%	30%
They let people bid, but were not helpful in explaining the bidding or the jobs.	27%	22%	23%
It was hard to bid and they did not seem to care whether I bid or not.	9%	12%	11%
	100%	100%	100%

A second theory about bidding which we studied was whether there were special sources of discouragement which kept workers from bidding. We had been told that family members kept women from bidding, or that fellow workers tended to hold one another back. We therefore asked the trainees whether they were discouraged in any way be anyone about bidding. The results, as shown in Table 21, are that 25 per cent of the trainees ran into someone trying to discourage them from bidding. Fellow workers, and these are mostly men, plus the personnel office and foremen or supervisors, were cited by the trainees as attempting to discourage them. Family members were not mentioned at all.

The most important point about the sources of discouragement, however, is that it had no significant effect on bidding. If the workers didn't bid, it was for some of the other reasons cited earlier.

Table 21

TRAINEES BIDDING BEHAVIOR RELATED TO WHETHER ANYONE ATTEMPTED TO DISCOURAGE THEM FROM BIDDING

Source of Any Discouragement About Bidding	Per cent Who Did Not Bid	Per cent Who Bid on Job Requiring A Job Trial	Total Trainees
Fellow workers	8%	7%	7%
Personnel Office	3%	8%	7%
Foreman or Supervisor	10%	7%	8%
Family members	0	0	0
Others	2%	3%	3%
Not discouraged by anyone	77%	75%	75%
	100%	100%	100%

The major evaluative question is whether the JPT program produced an increase in bidding. Forty-three per cent of the trainees had bid in 1973 and, as reported earlier, 83 per cent of the trainees bid in 1974.

The finding that the proportion of JPT trainees who bid nearly doubled from the season before training to the season after training suggests the program had a substantial impact. But since there was no control group it does not entirely answer the question about how much of the effect is due to the program. Stated differently, we don't know how many more of these people would have bid in 1974 compared with 1973 if there were no program.

To gain more perspective on the effects of the program differences in bidding rates between those who had JPT training only and those who had also gone through the ARC course were studied. That there might be an interaction between the two

courses was first suggested by a JPT instructor who pointed out to us that it helped the JPT training if the workers had first gone through ARC training. For those who had not gone through ARC, the instructor found it sometimes necessary to use some of the JPT training time to familiarize the person with the plant operations, the role of the job they were to be trained for and the bidding process. This and other comments lead us to test the survey results to see whether those who had ARC training in addition to JPT had different experiences.

There is a modest, but statistically significant, difference between the experiences of one group who did not bid in 1973 and then attended only JPT training and another group who also did not bid in 1973, but then attended both ARC and JPT. Overall, seven per cent more of those with both ARC and JPT bid in 1974 than did those who went only to JPT. Table 22 below summarizes these differences.

Table 22

BIDDING EXPERIENCE OF TRAINEES
WHO DID NOT BID IN 1973 AND THEN
ATTENDED JPT OR COMBINED JPT AND ARC

Training Component	Did NOT Bid in 1973: Did Bid in 1974	Did NOT Bid in 1974	Total
Attended JPT training only	76%	24%	100%
Attended both JPT and ARC training	83%	17%	100%

Table 23, on the following page, provides data for the entire group. It shows that the non-bidders in 1973 were more likely to take both programs in 1974. This group experienced a very large increase in the per cent bidding (52 per cent). Both ended about the same in the 1974 bidding.

Table 23

COMPARISON OF BIDDING BEHAVIOR FOR JPT TRAINEES BETWEEN 1973 AND 1974 SEASONS

Training Component	Per cent Who Bid in 1973	Per cent Who Bid in 1974	Per cent Increase in Bidding 1973 to 1974
JPT training only	50%	81%	31%
JPT training and ARC training combined	33%	85%	52%

Jobs Trials

The most distressing finding of the survey was that only about half (52 per cent) of those who bid for a job got a job trial. The proportion of those bidding on a job for which they were trained and then got a job trial is even lower (46 per cent).

These results were counterbalanced somehat by the finding that 82 per cent of those who got job trials passed them. The cumulative effect, however, was that only about a third (35 per cent) of the total JPT trainee group successfully went through the bidding and job trial processes. Only about one fifth (21 per cent) successfully went through the bidding and job trial processes on the specific jobs for which they were trained.

Table 24 summarizes the bidding and job trial results.

Table 24

JPT TRAINEES JOB
TRIAL OUTCOMES

Outcomes	Per cent of Total JPT Trainees: Any Bracket IV or Higher Bracket Job	Per cent of Total JPT Trainees: Job for Which Person was Trained
Bid	83%	57%
Bid and got job trial	43%	26%
Passed job trial	35%	21%

In terms of training efficiency the 21 per cent who finally obtained jobs for which they were trained is the most critical finding. The figure of 35 per cent who obtained some Bracket IV or higher job may be a better indicator of overall program impact, but it too is rather low. The fact that 82 per cent of the trainees passed their job trials suggests that the main problem was not in the trainees' ability to do the jobs once they got a chance. The biggest problem obviously lay in the finding that only about half of those who bid were given a job trial. Why was this so?

We have two elements of data out of the survey which offer some insight about the low job trial rates. A distribution of the larger plants by the percentage of their trainees who got job trials presented in Table 25, shows a wide spread with the bottom four plants giving job trials to an average of only 16 per cent of those who bid. In contrast, the top four plants gave job trials to 84 per cent of those who bid.

Table 25

PERCENTAGE OF JPT TRAINEES
WHO BID AND WHO ALSO
RECEIVED A JOB TRIAL*

Per cent of Those Who Bid Who Also Received a Job Trial	Number of Plants	Per cent of Plants
0 - 20%	4	18%
21 - 40%	5	23%
41 - 60%	5	23%
61 - 80%	6	27%
81 - 100%	2	9%
Total	22	100%

Footnote:

*For the purposes of this and comparable tables we restricted the count to those plants which had 10 or more JPT trainees, of whom we interviewed at least 6. This restriction minimizes the sampling error by insuring that we had interviewed at least half the trainees in the plants with the fewest participants.

It is clear from the distribution that plant conditions or characteristics were major factors in determining how many trainees got job trials. Some may be economic factors such as the rate of growth in jobs and the rate of turnover in the work force. Others may be the policies and attitudes related to the affirmative action effort. For example, some plants encouraged and facilitated the advancement of women and others did not.

The other element of data from the survey offers some further perspective about the possible impact of economic and organizational factors. This element is the responses of the trainees to the question, "Why do you think that you did not get the job you bid on?" The answers obviously reflect an often subjective view from the trainees' perspective and we do not have a counterbalancing view from the plant decision-makers view. Viewed with that qualification, the responses in Table 26 give some suggestive ideas.

Table 26

TRAINEES' PERCEPTIONS ABOUT
WHY THEY DID NOT GET THE
JOBS FOR WHICH THEY BID

Trainee Statements	Per cent Making the Statement
No openings	21%
Not enough seniority	19%
Discrimination against them or favoritism for a lower bracketed person	12%
Don't know	12%
Preferred current job, refused job or refused job trial	10%
Got or already had a higher bracketed job	8%
Did not have enough experience	3%
Not physically able to do the job	2%
Failed job trial	2%
Miscellaneous other reasons, including no response	11%
	100%

We see two important suggestions for explaining the variations in the job trial rate in the above table. If one looks at the first two responses together, "no openings" and "not enough seniority," they account for 40 per cent of the trainee ideas. These two responses suggest to us that job growth and turnover are probably significant factors.

The second possibility is the extent of discrimination or favoritism prevalent in the plant. The interviews give the impression that these factors may be more prevalent in some plants than in others.

After examining the ESL-ARC training results, we will present a statistical study seeking to explain the variations in job trial rates between plants.

Job Trial Success

The rate of success on all of the job trials, 82 per cent, seems to us to be quite high, although we have no norm by which to make a firm judgment. In any case, some individuals did fail their job trials. We asked those in our sample who had failed job trials why they thought that happened. There were a wide range of responses among a small group of interviewees (22) so presenting a table of their responses would not be meaningful. We can cite some of the responses, however, to give a sense of the range. "I guess I was too slow," "I don't know why, I thought I did the job," "the supervisor wanted to give the job to a relative," "I wasn't physically able to do the job," and "I was discouraged by the supervisor."

We asked the trainees three other questions about their job trial experience which shed some light on the factors involved in success and failure. One question asked of all those who got job trials was, what was their foreman's or supervisor's attitude during the job trial? We have frequently been told that foremen and supervisors are important in determining who is successful in the jobs. Moreover, other research on industry training programs has indicated that the climate of acceptance created by supervisors is probably the most important factor in determining trainees' success. The responses of the trainees to the question about supervisors' attitudes confirms the impression we had gotten and the other research. Also Table 27 shows, a significantly higher proportion (71 per cent) of trainees who passed job trials gave the most favorable rating to their foreman's attitude and a significantly high proportion (51 per cent) of trainees who failed job trials gave their foreman the most negative rating. Clearly since the interviews were after the fact this is not a conclusive finding as it is possible the success or failure was projected on the supervisor as the cause.

Table 27

TRAINEES' PERCEPTION OF FOREMAN'S ATTITUDE DURING THEIR JOB TRIAL ON JOBS FOR WHICH THE INDIVIDUALS HAD RECEIVED JPT TRAINING

Foreman's Attitude	Per cent Judgment of Trainees Who Passed	Per cent Judgment of Trainees Who Failed	Total
He seemed to want me to get the job and was helpful, encouraging and patient	71%	21%	64%
He seemed to want me to get the job, but didn't help very much	5%	10%	6%
He didn't seem to care whether I got the job and he was not helpful and patient while I learned	15%	18%	15%
It seemed he did not want me to get the job and was impatient and discouraging	9%	51%	15%
	100%	100%	100%

Related to the attitude of foremen in determining job trial success is the attitudes of fellow workers. Very much the same response was offered by the trainees about the attitudes of their fellow workers during their job trials as about the attitudes of their foremen. Those who failed job trials gave a significantly worse rating to their fellow workers' attitudes in comparison with those who passed the job trials. Table 28 presents these results.

Table 28

TRAINEES' PERCEPTION OF THE
ATTITUDES OF THEIR FELLOW WORKERS
DURING THEIR JOB TRIALS ON JPT JOBS

Trainees' Perceptions	Per cent Judgment of Trainees Who Passed	Per cent Judgment of Trainees Who Failed	Total Trainees
My fellow workers were helpful and many were encouraging in my job trial	77%	47%	73%
My fellow workers were indifferent or were not helpful and were discouraging in my job trial	23%	53%	27%
	100%	100%	100%

It is important to note, however, that high proportions of both foremen (64 per cent) and fellow workers (73 per cent) were perceived as quite helpful and encouraging to the trainees. There were negative attitudes but the problems caused, if any, were limited to 25-30 per cent of the work force.

The final issue we explored concerning job trial success was the role of training. In general, we have avoided asking the trainees whether they like the training program or found it useful. We did this because our experience in the past is that trainees have generally good feelings about training and will give optimistic general responses which are not an especially good guide to evaluating a program. We therefore sought a more objective approach to asking about trainee perceptions of the value of training. We asked the trainees how well they felt the training prepared them for their job trials. In general the groups who passed and those who failed their job trials gave very much the same responses. There are no significant differences in the responses by the two groups as presented in Table 29. It is rather an oddity, even, that more of those who failed their job trials gave the training program the highest rating than did those who passed the job trials. Moreover, the only completely negative responses came from those who passed their job trials.

Table 29

Perception of Training	Per cent Judgment of Trainees Who Passed	Per cent Judgment of Trainees Who Failed	Total
I really knew how to do the job because it was just like the training	18%	32%	20%
I had to learn more about the job, but the training helped a lot	71%	53%	68%
I had to learn a lot because the job was much different from the training	8%	15%	9%
The training did not help at all	3%	0%	3%
	100%	100%	100%

Advancement

The final indicator of program performance is the rate of advancement from the 1973 pay bracket to higher pay brackets during the 1974 canning season. Of the total JPT trainees, 47 per cent advanced at least one pay bracket. Fifty-one per cent remained in their original pay bracket and 2 per cent declined. Eighteen per cent of the trainees advanced two or more brackets.

The 47 per cent of trainees who advanced at least one bracket exceeds the proportion who got a job trial (43 per cent) and substantially exceeds the proportion who passed job trials (35 per cent). We attribute this difference to the variations in the work rules from plant to plant. For example, the 5 per cent of those who did not bid for the jobs for which they were trained because they got other opportunities at Bracket III or higher are certainly part of the group who advanced without being shown as bidding or in most cases even as having a job trial. The personnel office or supervisor or foreman simply went to them and asked them to take a job.

Table 30, below, summarizes the results of bracket movement for the JPT trainees.

Table 30

PERCENTAGE MOVEMENTS
IN PAY BRACKETS
BY JPT TRAINEES

Training Component	Decrease in Bracket	No Change in Bracket	Increase in Pay Brackets			
			One Br.	Two Brs.	Three Brs.	Cumulative One or More Brackets
JPT only	1%	49%	32%	14%	4%	50%
JPT and ARC	2%	54%	26%	16%	2%	44%
Total JPT	2%	51%	29%	15%	3%	47%

The Second Year Results: ESL and ARC

ESL training was part of the original course, along with basic education, in 1972-73. The course was changed substantially for the second year as an entire package of materials was developed using the special vocabulary and problem situations characteristic of canning plants. The same material was used by the training contractor for the Joint Committee and by the public adult education schools in San Jose and Sacramento which provided ESL for cannery workers.

The ARC program evolved during the year of cannery LOTT training. For the second year of cannery training a more elaborate ARC program was developed using slide films and other materials.

ESL and ARC have the same general goal as JPT--to facilitate the advancement of women and minority men within the cannery job structure. The course goals are less specific in that they are directed toward increasing the use of the bidding system, but are not intended to assist workers to pass job trials for specific cannery jobs.

The data presented for ESL and ARC is drawn entirely from plant records. No explanatory and analytical information from trainees is available. Hence we offer a much briefer discussion of these two programs than was presented for JPT. There is some

289-748 O - 78 - 6

comparative information available about these courses from the first year of training in the canneries.

Bidding

Sixty-four per cent of the ARC-ESL trainees bid on a job requiring a job trial. This is lower than the 83 per cent for the JPT trainees, but the ARC-ESL group includes many people who are mono-lingual in Spanish or Chinese. Bidding, therefore, would appear to compare favorably with the other program. It certainly is better than the experience with the same programs in 1973 when about 30 per cent of the trainees bid for jobs requiring a job trial. Some of the increase is undoubtedly due to improvements in the training, but another portion of the increase is probably due to the generally increased awareness of bidding and encouragement by the plant staff. Also, the change in the pay bracket structure had undoubtedly limited the prior year bidding.

Bidding patterns for these components did vary a great deal from plant to plant. Table 31, below, presents the percentages of the trainees who bid in 22 plants with the largest groups of program participants.

Table 31

PERCENTAGE OF ESL-ARC TRAINEES BIDDING FOR A JOB REQUIRING A JOB TRIAL

Per cent of ESL-ARC Trainees Bidding for a Job Requiring a Job Trial	Number of Plants	Per cent of Plants
0 - 20%	0	0
21 - 40%	3	13%
41 - 60%	5	23%
61 - 80%	7	32%
81 - 100%	7	32%
Total	22	100%

The Chinese-Americans had been a group of special concern in the prior year program. Few entered JPT, but those in ESL-ARC increased their bidding rate after training to 25 per cent in 1974 compared to just 4 per cent in 1973.

Job Trials

Thirty-five per cent of the ESL-ARC trainees received job trials, which is 54 per cent of those who bid. The proportion of those receiving a job trial of those who bid is equivalent to JPT (54 per cent compared to 52 per cent for JPT). The 35 per cent of the 1974 ESL-ARC trainees gaining a job trial is a 40 per cent improvement over the 25 per cent who got job trials in the prior year program. But like the JPT program, the job trial rate is much lower than would seem desirable given the relatively high bidding rate.

Corresponding to their increased bidding rate, 11 per cent of the Chinese-Americans got job trials compared to 4 per cent in 1973.

As with the JPT program, there was a great deal of variation between the larger plants in the rate of job trials. Table 32 gives the percentage distribution of job trials by plant.

Table 32

PERCENTAGE OF ESL-ARC TRAINEES
WHO BID AND WHO ALSO
RECEIVED A JOB TRIAL

Per cent of Who Bid Who Also Received a Job Trial	Number of Plants	Per cent of Plants
0 - 20%	6	30%
21 - 40%	7	35%
41 - 60%	6	30%
61 - 80%	1	5%
81 - 100%	0	0
Total	20	100%

Thirty-two per cent of the ESL-ARC trainees were successful in completing the bidding and job trial processes. This number compares quite favorably with the 35 per cent of the JPT trainees who were similarly successful. The average for the entire prior year program had been 21 per cent. Nine per cent of the Chinese-Americans successfully went through the bidding and job trial process compared to none in the first year program.

Advancement

Thirty-four per cent of the ESL-ARC trainees advanced at least one pay bracket between the 1973 and 1974 seasons. The 34 per cent who advanced at least one bracket is somewhat ahead of the weighted average for 1973 which was 30 per cent. It is well behind the 47 per cent figure for those in JPT who advanced at least one bracket. Table 33 summarizes the bracket movement data for ESL-ARC.

Table 33

PERCENTAGE MOVEMENTS
IN PAY BRACKETS
BY ESL AND ARC TRAINEES

Training Component	Decrease in Bracket	No Change in Bracket	Increase in Pay Brackets			
			One Br.	Two Brs.	Three Brs.	Cumulative One or More Brackets
ESL	3%	69%	20%	4%	4%	28%
ARC	4%	60%	23%	9%	4%	36%
ESL-ARC	0	73%	9%	18%	0	27%
Total ESL-ARC	3%	63%	22%	8%	4%	34%

Analysis of Variations Between Plants in Job Trial Rates

These findings were presented to a joint industry-union conference in May, 1975.

Our conclusion was that the bidding and job trial success rates were satisfactory and only minor (5 per cent to 10 per cent) increases might be expected in these rates. But the rate at which job trials were given to those who bid appeared too low, as it did also in the ESL-ARC programs. And, not only was the

overall rate low, but the rates for the 22 largest plants ranged from 14 per cent to 95 per cent. Largely as a consequence of the low job trial rate, only 35 per cent of the trainees completed job trials and only 21 per cent ultimately gained jobs for which they had been trained.

Discussion focused on the reasons for the low job trial rates and rate variation between plants. Most thought variations between plants was probably caused by different number of job openings. Simply stated, the plants with more openings posted per worker were probably those with the higher job trial rates. Others suggested some plants might be giving training to workers too low in seniority to qualify for a trial.

To test these theories we built profiles of each plant using overall plant rates of job growth, turnover and comparative seniority. We developed 12 different measures using data from the 1973, 1974 and 1975 seniority lists. We used step-wise linear regression methods to examine the degree to which differences in the plant's scores on JPT job trial rates, as well as on five other performance measures, were explained by differences in the plant turnover and growth rates and relative seniority of trainees. The results of the analysis are simple, even if somewhat surprising. The variations in overall plant turnover and growth rates and in relative seniority do not explain a significant amount of the variation from plant to plant in job trial rates. The maximum co-efficient of determination (R^2) was .308 leaving 70 per cent of the variation unexplained. For those who want to examine the analysis in detail Appendix B contains the list of variables used and the results of the statistical analysis.

Since these factors apparently were relatively unimportant we next turned to an examination of the jobs held by workers who first gained regular status in the 1974 season. Our theory was that the make up of these jobs and the proportion of women who got them would be reasonable indications of the general experience with bidding and job trials in the plants.

Several important results emerged from the analysis:

1. There were more new regulars than we expected.* Using the 22 largest plants as the base we estimate there were between 700 and 750 total new regulars in the whole group of 52 plants which participated in the program. By comparison, there were about 750 JPT trainees in 1974. Thus the new regular positions therefore appear to be much more appropriate as a

*Regulars are those who work a minimum of 1400 hours in a year.

specific target of the training efforts than had been recognized up to that point.

2. Reflecting the historic hiring patterns those plants with the most openings at Bracket III and higher had the fewest women as new regulars. Conversely, those plants with the most openings at lower bracket levels, had higher proportions of women among new regulars. Table 34 shows these patterns by plants.

Table 34

NEW REGULAR JOBS
BY PAY BRACKET*

	Plants With Lowest Per cent of Women Among New Regulars	Plants With Medium Per cent of Women Among New Regulars	Plants With Highest Per cent of Women Among New Regulars
Per cent of Jobs in Bracket III or Higher	86%	66%	56%
Per cent of Jobs in Bracket IV	4%	20%	24%
Per cent of Jobs in Bracket V	10%	14%	20%
	100%	100%	100%

*Data is for the 22 largest plants in this and following tables.

3. As expected from the prior point, the higher the bracket of the job, the more likely it was to be filled by a man. Women were at the parity level with men in Bracket IV, but received only 17 per cent of the Bracket III and higher jobs. Table 35 presents the wage bracket distribution between men and women.

Table 35

PERCENTAGE OF NEW REGULAR JOBS
HELD BY WOMEN AND MEN

	Per cent Men	Per cent Women	Total
Bracket III	83%	17%	100%
Bracket IV	50%	50%	100%
Bracket V	44%	66%	100%

4. New regulars held more than 70 different jobs. But half of all the jobs (49 per cent) and almost 3/4's (73 per cent) of the Bracket III or higher jobs occurred in just six job categories. Table 36 shows these jobs in terms of the number received by men and women.

Table 36

JOBS HELD BY NEW REGULARS

	Men		Women		Totals	
Job Category	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Mechanic	93	100%	0	0%	93	100%
Lift Truck and Related Jobs	65	85%	11	15%	76	100%
Supervisor and Sub-supervisor	15	71%	6	29%	21	100%
Label Machine	7	37%	12	63%	19	100%
Crew Leader	4	22%	14	78%	18	100%
Electrician	17	100%	0	0%	17	100%
	201	82%	42	18%	244	100%

5. The number of new regulars fluctuates a great deal from plant to plant and from year to year in each individual plant. The 1975 average for the plants was 24 new regulars, but eight plants of the 22

had fewer than 11 new regular positions and 7 had 31 or more new regulars on the 1975 lists.

6. Women did well in the new regular openings for the JPT jobs on the seamer (83 per cent), caser (67 per cent) and label machine (57 per cent). But they only got 15 per cent of the lift truck, and related jobs.

7. Altogether, women got only 17 per cent of the new regular jobs at Bracket III and higher. If they had gotten the proportion of lift truck jobs equal to their share of the work force with over three years seniority (56 per cent), the women's per cent of the new regular jobs at Bracket III and above would increase to 26 per cent. The women's per cent of new regular Bracket III and higher jobs cannot increase much further, however, without their gaining many openings in the mechanic and electrician categories.

What answers do these results suggest for the questions about the variations in job trial rates as well as about the future directions for the training program?

The fact that the overall plant rates of turnover and growth in jobs and relative seniority did not explain a significant portion of the variation in job trial rates leaves at least two possible answers. One is that non-economic factors such as the degree to which an affirmative action selection policy had actually been implemented at all levels of decision making in the plants may be very important in explaining the variations in job trial rates. In the lift truck category for instance, in the plants with the highest proportion of women among new regulars, women gained 9 of 14 (64 per cent) of the lift truck positions. In contrast, in the plants with the lowest proportion of women among new regulars, women did not gain any of the 10 new regular lift truck positions. Overall, only 45 per cent of the trainees who bid for lift truck got job trials even though this was the second largest category of new regular positions. Another 10 per cent did get a job trial on some other Bracket III or higher job, but that leaves 45 per cent without a job trial at that level. As previously noted, only 15 per cent of the new regular lift truck positions went to women.

Another part of the answer may be that there are so many different jobs and the mix of openings in these jobs varies so much from season to season that selection is a very random or happenstance process. Unlike more structured and highly developed

internal labor markets, there are no lines of progression for advancement in the canneries. When a person takes training and bids at the beginning of the season for up to three jobs, there are two uncertainties (1) who has the highest seniority among the specific group who also bid for that job, and (2) will there be an opening in that particular job? If either gamble is wrong, the person would not gain a job trial even though there may be a large number of openings in other job categories and the person might have ample seniority to qualify for many of them.

This study of variations in turnover rates confirms the industry-union perception of the need for continuing lift truck training and instituting a mechanics training program. But the training also needs to be accompanied by changes in the selection structure and process. Some of the possibilities for the future discussed at various times by the industry-union representatives and the training contractor are:

1. Create a reservoir of trained workers who are in line to take openings as they occur over an extended period, thus creating a line of progression;

2. Continue the training until the person is certified as competent and thereby abolishing the job trial phase;

3. Permit bidding for a cluster of jobs so that a person might be drawn into one of several jobs as openings occur, in effect creating zones of progression;

4. Require bidding as a precondition of training and estimate openings so that approximately only the needed number of trained workers is available.

Assessment

Although we do not have experimental design measures as we did for the first year cannery program, a reasonable assessment can be made using the first year results as benchmarks on all the evaluative criteria: affirmative action, net impact and cost benefit. Following are discussions of each.

Affirmative Action Gains

Improving the status of minority men continued to be a stated objective, but data from an industry-wide random sample survey showed that minority men already held jobs in all but the highest pay bracket approximately equal to their proportion in the work force. Advancing women therefore came to be the dominant concern. Hence, the main assessment criterion focuses on the change in the proportion of women among new regular workers.

When we introduced the concept of sex parity in examining the first year program, we reported that among the 22 largest plants there was no meaningful increase in women. For the second year, there was a meaningful increase: The proportion of women among new regulars rose to 29.4 per cent on the seniority lists issued at the beginning of 1975 in comparison with 21.0 per cent on the 1974 lists and 20.2 per cent on the 1973 lists. Adjusting the increase shown on the 1975 lists for the small (3.96 per cent) increase between the two prior years, an increase which might be expected to occur again without the second year program changes, the net increase in the proportion of women among new regulars is estimated as 35 per cent. We think this increase can properly be attributed to the program, and its associated actions in the plants such as the pre-training interviews. Women became new regulars in 44 positions which were involved in the JPT program and these equal the 35 per cent increase. Data on the mix of jobs for the prior years would have to be examined to document the point, however.

We stated the increase was meaningful by which we mean that it showed the program was having the kind of impact intended. But was this impact great enough to meet the needs of the industry and the union considering the affirmative action pressures? The answer is no. Such an increase would have to be much larger. For example, if the affirmative action target for women was set at 30 per cent of the regular jobs, a target level discussed in the early negotiations with EEOC, it would take five years with women gaining 55 to 60 per cent of all new regular positions to reach this target. This calculation is made under the assumptions that there is a 10 per cent turnover rate among regulars, including the women themselves who make regular and that they began by holding about 10 per cent of all regular positions. This 55 to 60 per cent share of the new regular positions would require for the 22 largest plants that 290 to 320 women make regular each year. Given that about 100 were already making regular in the absence of the program, about 200 more would have to be added as a result of the program. This is about five times the impact registered in the second year. So while the conclusion remains that the program had a positive effect on parity for women its magnitude was still too low.

Net Impact of the Training

Other program dimensions are also important, especially in light of the obvious need to increase the overall impact if the program was to help resolve the affirmative action problems. Table 37 summarizes key results already reported. It compares the second year program against the first year and assumes, as we stated in Chapter II, that the first year had a small but measurable net impact. Improvements over the first year are therefore assumed to have produced greater net effects.

Table 37

SUMMARY OF TRAINING RESULTS
COMPARING FIRST AND SECOND
YEAR CANNERY PROGRAMS

Performance Measures	ESL-ARC Programs		JPT Program (2nd Yr. Only)	
	First Year	Second Year	Any Job Br. IV or Higher	Job for Which Trained
Bid for Bracket IV or Higher Job	29%	64%	83%	57%
Received Job Trial	25%	35%	43%	26%
Passed Job Trial	21%	32%	35%	21%
Increased One or More Pay Brackets	30%	34%	47%	
Increased Two or More Pay Brackets	6%	12%	18%	

Bidding rates improved and nearly reached the saturation point for those who went to JPT, if any Bracket IV or higher job is considered. The bidding rates for ESL-ARC and for JPT for the specific jobs for which the person trained were undoubtedly too low given the pressures on the industry and union. In the second year, for both groups of programs, the critical problem was the discrepancy between the bidding rates and rates at which trainees received job trials. Overall only 50 per cent of those who bid received job trials. Success is almost entirely determined by how many received job trials since 84 per cent of those who got job trials passed them.

The proportion of trainees who advanced two or more pay brackets, probably best illustrates the increased impact of the second year program over the first year. Three times as many advanced two or more brackets under JPT as did trainees in the first year. But this still calls attention to the limits of the program's effectiveness. Many more trainees than 18 per cent would have to advance two or more pay brackets for the program to produce a sufficient change in women's share of the higher paying jobs.

Cost-Benefit Analysis

Although comparative earning data is not available, a major increase in the benefits for the participants can be deduced from the increase in the proportion of women among the new regulars. While trainees in the first year cannery program averaged less than $2,000 in earned income and those in our sample remained in the seasonal category, an advance to regular status would produce a very large increase in income. Given the profile of the new women regulars their average wage would have been $3.88 per hour and they would have worked at least 1400 hours. On the average they would have earned more than $5,432, or a net increase of more than $3,432 above the $2,000. The approximately 40 new women regulars would then have aggregate net earnings of $137,280. The net income gain alone for this group in one year exceeds the training costs which were $145 per JPT trainee, or $108,750 total for JPT training. Considering that JPT could be expected to have a 5 year benefit period, the accumulated benefits, using a 10 per cent discount rate, would produce a cost/benefit ratio in excess of $5 in benefits to each $1 in cost.

The improvement in the performance measures for the ESL-ARC components probably also means that the return on the training investment improved over the first year. We do not have the data, however, to estimate whether the ESL component by itself, and particularly the Chinese-American group within it, improved enough to produce a positive cost/benefit.

Two notes are important about the cost-benefit analysis. One is to reiterate the point made in the prior chapter that income as a measure of benefits is the government's and the individual's primary benefit measure, but not that of the industry or union. As an affirmative action program, in the eyes of the industry, the women who advance displace men who would otherwise have taken the jobs. Unless the advancement of the women has helped solve the industry manpower problems, then the program appears as a cost to the employers. The employers would not look at the cost-benefit ratio as a performance indicator, but rather at the bidding and job trial

indicators, and they would want all of them to be as close to 100 per cent as possible so as to minimize their costs and maximize affirmative action progress.

The second note is to point out the limit of earned income as even a measure of individual participant benefits. Although unemployment insurance is normally dismissed from cost-benefit analysis because it is a transfer payment as opposed to payment for productive work, unemployment insurance looms very large in the individual calculus of seasonal cannery workers. If they are not working, they draw unemployment insurance (UI), which is not subject to federal or state income tax. An increase in income of $3,432 is therefore offset by a decrease in UI. Considering all the taxes on earned income, many of the seasonal cannery workers experience real tax rates of 60 to 80 per cent on earnings beyond the amount needed to qualify for UI payments. This real tax rate is the combination of actual taxes charged against their income and the lost UI payments which are likely to average about $65 per week. Yet it should be noted the loss of UI payments did not emerge in any of our trainee interviews as a reason for not bidding or for not accepting job trials.

Conclusions from the Second Year Cannery LOTT Program

The objective as noted, of the second year cannery program was to improve the employment status of women. Three conclusions are appropriate under the objective.

1. The second year program did produce a meaningful improvement in the employment status of women.

   The bases for the conclusion are:

   a. Forty-seven per cent of the trainees advanced one pay bracket or more and 18 per cent advanced two or more pay brackets. The comparable figures for the prior year were 30 per cent and 6 per cent. Using a control group for comparison, the first year program had made a small, but meaningful, net increase in income so the greater advancement rate in the second year can be judged to have produced a higher net effect.

   b. There was a net increase in the proportion of women among new regulars of 35 per cent; they gained 29.4 per cent of the new positions on the 1975 seniority lists compared to an average of 20.6 per cent for the prior two years.

2. <u>The program would not be sufficient in itself at its current level of impact, to solve the affirmative action problem on behalf of women.</u>

   The conclusion is based on the estimate that the impact of the program would have to increase to, and remain at, the level where women received 55 to 60 per cent of the new regular positions each year.

3. <u>In order to achieve the affirmative action goals, a set of interrelated improvements would have to be made in the training.</u>

   Many of the improvements seen as necessary by the industry and union representatives were:

   a. Increasing the rate at which those who were trained for a job bid for the job.

   b. Greatly increasing the rate at which those who bid for a job got a chance to perform it (a job trial).

   c. Opening up opportunities through training and perhaps other methods into the mechanic jobs and the craft jobs such as electricians.

These changes became the basis for modifications in the program for the third year. The first step was to create a new course in January, 1975, called Machine Familiarization Course (MFC). The course was offered to all seasonal workers in seniority order who had signed up for JPT and it continued until June when the season started. The course provided two days of introductory work with the machinery and one day of discussion of the working conditions and requirements involved with the job. The trainees at that point were required to decide whether they would like to have the job and receive the full training. If they were interested, they were then required to bid for the job as a condition of continued training. This was an important departure from the view that the program was a union negotiated benefit which seniority employees could draw on as they wished. The MFC portion was seen as a way to preserve some of the sense of training as an unqualified benefit.

The second step was to begin to get the plants to estimate openings expected for the next year. These estimates would then be used as the basis for specifying the number of workers who would be trained for each job, and the hope was that the job trial rate would greatly increase.

The third step was to begin serious planning for an industry-wide training program for the mechanic job.

Looming ahead, however, were two critical issues yet to be resolved:

1. Could training be provided to a degree which would fully qualify workers for the jobs so that they would not have to pass subsequent job trials? A related question was, what would happen if a high seniority woman became qualified for a job? Would she be able to bump lower seniority men from the jobs?

2. Would the training be accepted as part of the EEOC conciliation agreement?

CHAPTER IV

THE FUTURE OF CANNERY TRAINING

The Third Year Program

The third year program (1974-75) largely continued the pattern of the second year, but it operated almost entirely with funds set aside under the 1973 collective bargaining agreement. Advancement Related Counseling (ARC), Job Proficiency Training (JPT) and English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) were all offered, as was the new Machine Familiarization Course (MFC).

Known informally as the "shoppers special," the machine familiarization training can appropriately be seen as an extension of the counseling and job opportunities information in ARC since it allowed the workers to handle some of the equipment to help them decide if they wished to pursue the job and the training. Trainees were required to bid for the machine jobs before they could continue into JPT.

In the Spring of 1975 training was extended to canning plants in the outlying communities of Northern California after the major centers were closed. Eleven plants and 312 additional workers entered the program. To the surprise of the training contractor, 269 of the 354 applicants for training asked for ARC. The expectation had been that they would concentrate on JPT machine training.

Two other developments of importance occurred in the third year. One was that preliminary plans were developed for an off-season pre-apprenticeship course for mechanics. Not only did the industry need the capability to train women as mechanics for affirmative action purposes, but it also had continuing manpower problems with mechanic positions which had not been met by the on-the-job training program in the collective bargaining agreement.

Second, the company and union representatives agreed the individual plants should have trainers of their own rather than continuing to rely entirely on the external training contractor. The concept was that the contractor would help select and train the plant trainers and would monitor the overall program. There were mixed feelings about shifting to plant staff for training, especially among some of the union leaders who felt the principle of training as a negotiated benefit would disappear entirely unless the union could maintain some industry-wide policy direction over the program. The training contractor was therefore cast, at least in part, in a surveillance role helping the union maintain some policy direction.

The Labor Department did not have a direct investment in the third year of cannery training and the program data was not

289-748 O - 78 - 7

collected as it had been for the first two years. We therefore cannot report on bidding, job trial and advancement results for that year.

The Wait for the Conciliation Agreement

Neither the pre-apprenticeship nor the plant trainer programs moved from the preliminary planning stages until the Spring of 1976. Indeed, all training halted between July, 1975, and November, 1976, as protracted negotiations continued between the canning companies and union, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). One issue which held up a conciliation agreement was whether all of the parties who had filed discrimination suits or who might file such suits would agree to a final settlement. The other issue, and one which made further training at company expense seem unprofitable, was whether the training program would be accepted within the agreement as an appropriate response to the affirmative action problem.

Some additional ground work for implementing the eventual agreement was accomplished in the interim, especially as the form of the agreement became clearer. These activities included:

1. Criteria were developed for selecting plant trainers and prospective candidates were assessed in terms of the criteria.

2. Detailed minimum competency standards or criteria were developed for three high bracket jobs which had high turnover and appeared to be strategic entry points into the highest bracket mechanic, supervisor and craft jobs. These jobs were lift truck driver, oiler-greaser and label machine operator. The intention was that if training was accepted as part of the final conciliation agreement, the training objective would be to bring the trainees to a level of competence required for the job. Those who failed could not qualify for the job.

3. A system was developed to select and train plant staff, either women or minority group men, who could serve as liason staff between the affirmative action director and the "affected class members" in the plants.

4. The design for the pre-apprenticeship mechanic training program was completed.

The Conciliation Agreement and the Consent Decree

A basic conciliation agreement was negotiated between EEOC and the cannery companies and union in February, 1975, as a resolution of a private class action discrimination suit filed in December, 1973. When the agreement was placed before the U.S. District Court in San Francisco to determine its adequacy, motions were filed to intervene in the suit by groups contesting various aspects of the agreement and challenging its overall adequacy. The court held extensive hearings during which changes in the agreement were negotiated and then the court approved the agreement in May, 1976. A second objection was raised against the agreement and a final consent decree validating the agreement was issued by the court in September, 1976.

One of the major complaints against the conciliation agreement was that it placed an excessive emphasis on off-season training as a remedial strategy. Those opposed preferred back pay to training and argued that only the mechanic job required anything more than minimal on-the-job training. Moreover, since the industry somehow trained white males in the past it was argued no elaborate machinery was required for women and minorities.

Indeed, it is these off-season training provisions which distinguish the agreement from most other agreements which have been developed under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. It appears that many industries have argued that training programs will have to be created to accomplish the affirmative action goals, but EEOC has generally shied away from training solutions in favor of direct punitive payments to those who have suffered from discrimination, accompanied by changes in seniority provisions and advancement or entry routes. In this case the court approved the training provisions saying that there was "no credible evidence" in support of the claims that training was not needed. The judge said further:[7]

> The Proponents have not argued that extensive off-season training is needed for all high-bracket jobs, but only for certain jobs which can lead to regular status. There is ample evidence showing the need for off-season training in these particular high-bracket jobs. With regard to mechanic training, the evidence is clear that the hectic pace in the plant during the processing season prevents effective on-the-job training at least for the initial stages of such training. Moreover, the off-season paid

---

[7]Opinion dated May 4, 1976, No. C-73-2153, by U.S. District Judge William H. Orrick, Northern District of California, in the case of Maria Alaniz, et al., vs. California Processors, Inc., et al.

training under the settlement constitutes a substantial monetary benefit to class members, since class members will be paid during the time they are receiving training.

The main provisions of the conciliation agreement are:

1. It set goals for employment of women over the five year life of the agreement at 30 per cent of the positions in all high-bracket jobs (Brackets III and above), except for mechanic which is to be 20 per cent. Minority group members are to achieve parity in employment measured by the proportion of the minority group members in the county population. Minority group men have already achieved parity in many plants in all pay brackets except the highest.

2. One-for-one placement of qualified women and minorities is required until the goals are achieved and maintained, that is, for every Anglo male hired, one woman or minority male must be hired.

3. The informal incumbency rule was eliminated so that all workers with appropriate seniority and job qualifications can directly claim a job at the beginning of a season even if an incumbent is thereby bumped out of the job.

4. The concept of "plant seniority" was added. This means seniority is measured from the earliest seasonal or regular seniority date of hire. This provision effectively eliminated the dual seniority lists, for regular and seasonal, which stood as a primary barrier to the advancement of women.

5. To facilitate advancement of women and minorities, off-season training is to be provided for high-bracket positions based on the number of anticipated vacancies. The training will be up to three weeks in duration and may involve up to three jobs. Employees receive their regular rate of pay during the training, rather than the $2.50 daily stipend which had been paid.

6. Employees who complete the high-bracket job training will be considered qualified and thus can use their plant seniority to claim a job for which they trained.

7. A mechanic off-season pre-apprenticeship program which could last up to one year is also required. At the end of the training the women or minorities will be considered qualified Bracket III Mechanics (this is the apprentice classification) and they can use their plant seniority to claim the jobs.

8. An advanced craft skill training program is required for positions such as machinist, electrician, pipe fitter and instrument mechanic. The training is available only to women and minorities and will be conducted through qualified trade schools, high schools, junior colleges and other training institutions. The program will involve a stipend payment and tuition refunds.

9. Promotion incentive bonuses will be offered to women and minority group members in the amount of $150 for the first 500 hours worked in a high-bracket job and $150 for the second 500 hours.

10. An affirmative action fund was created with contributions of 3¢ per hour worked over the five year period. This contribution was estimated to produce a fund of $5,000,000. Consistent with the general EEOC perspective, the priorities for use of the money are first punitive damages for prior discrimination, second, incentive bonuses up to $1,000,000, and third, all training costs.

Implementing the Agreement

With the groundwork already laid, active implementation of the conciliation agreement began after the 1976 canning season. The training contractor initiated the plant trainers' program in October and finished for all plants by January, 1977. The training took two weeks and sought to teach use of a competency-based curriculum, called Criterion Referenced Instruction (CRI). The emphasis, of course, was placed on the competency-based instruction because all of the graduates would be officially qualified for the jobs they had studied. The trainer training was intended to provide an understanding of affirmative action, and specific skills in communication, instruction, planning, negotiating and problem solving. Overall, the program was expected to prepare the plant trainers so they could organize and manage in-plant job training programs under the general supervision of the training contractor.

Skill training for high bracket jobs began in January, 1977, with a plan to train 850 workers to become qualified lift truck drivers, label machine operators and oiler-greasers. Additionally, the target in the Spring of 1977 was to train 150 Bracket III apprentice mechanics, all of whom would be women or minority group men.

It is important to note that bidding was not required as a pre-condition to entering training. The conformance committee set up by the conciliation agreement concluded the bidding requirement would unduly restrict entry into the training program.*

Also missing from the 1977 training program were the ARC and ESL courses. The general judgment is that the ARC course had served its purpose by establishing an awareness on the part of the seasonal workers of the bidding process and the jobs available in the plants. Moreover, the conciliation agreement made the function of providing workers with information and counseling a direct responsibility of the union. This element of the agreement accords with a long standing view held by many in the union and the companies that the function of information and counseling about advancement opportunities should be a union responsibility.

The high bracket skill training was limited during the year to the three jobs, but as new needs are identified, additional courses will be developed.

The pre-apprenticeship program for mechanics consists of two to three weeks of classroom instruction with on-the-job training following in the plants.

Conclusions About the Future LOTT Cannery Programs

The original LOTT objectives can be broken down into two statements: One objective was to determine whether the lay-off period could be used constructively to help dead-ended workers advance. The second objective was to determine if non-skills training is the appropriate training.

The conclusions relative to these two statements are as follows:

1. The lay-off period was not only found to be useful, but in the canning industry it is the only period

*As of April, 1977, the Conformance Committee has accepted bidding as a prerequisite, but only so long as it is presented to trainees as an expression of serious intent and not an irrevocable commitment.

in which an organized training program can be provided.

2. Non-skills training was not found to be useful in the opinion of the parties as a general approach to upgrading training.

There are those in the union who believe that English-as-a-second language and other basic education training ought to be available to the workers as a negotiated benefit, but given the insistance by EEOC and the canning companies on achieving the highest rate of advancement possible for the level of training investment, the non-skills training did not remain a part of the program.

It is entirely possible that basic education may yet be required to implement the mechanics and crafts training provisions of the conciliation agreement. Even though there have been two years of planning, the mechanics training program, when it is developed, will be untested and will almost certainly go through a period of learning and devlopment through trial and error. Especially if the mechanics training and the craft training seek to draw any of the older women or the Spanish speaking, basic education of some kind may become essential.

Without non-skills training, an interesting paradox could emerge. The older women and the Spanish speaking--the primary victims of prior discrimination--may be effectively excluded from participation. The younger women and the younger English speaking minority people may be the primary beneficiaries of the cannery affirmative action program even though it was their older associates who suffered discrimination.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS,

AND POLICY ANALYSIS

Summary

This report has presented the experience and conclusions from an Experimental and Demonstration project testing the concept of lay-off time training in a single industry, the Northern California Canning Industry. The project was supported over a five year period by the Office of Research and Development of the Employment and Training Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor. Rather than being a static test of a precise concept, the project is best seen as an excellent action research effort in which ideas are tested, evaluated and modified again. After a very discouraging initial experience, the final results of the effort were quite positive.

In the first effort the target group were workers on short-term lay-off from the industrial plants in the Antioch-Pittsburg area of California. The program consisted of adult basic education in reading and mathematics and group counseling and sensitivity sessions. The major finding of the first year was that the primary target group of workers did not come to the program in satisfactory numbers.

In the second year efforts were made to develop special programs in a glass container firm and in the paper products industry. The employers and the unions supported the projects and encouraged the workers to participate, but it was unsuccessful since few workers sought training.

The primary conclusion after two years was that non-skills training will not be attractive to workers on temporary lay-off in industries which have highly developed internal labor markets, with clear lines of progression, limited entry points and promotion based on seniority.

The idea that lay-off time could be used constructively nevertheless persisted. Some clues from the initial experience led to identifying the canning industry as an industry which might benefit from lay-off time training because of its special characteristics. One obvious characteristic is that long-term employees experience extended lay-offs each year and are assured of recall to work. Additionally the canning industry was coming under increasing affirmative action pressures. Interviews with company and union representatives found favorable responses to the idea of conducting an industry-specific lay-off time training experiment in the Northern California canning industry. Soon

thereafter the industry and the union joined together to seek Department of Labor financial support of this experiment.

The first year of the cannery training program consisted of basic education and English-as-a-second language. Information and counseling about jobs and the bidding and advancement processes was interspersed within the courses. Training was offered in four sites--Sacramento, Modesto, Oakland and Hayward--each of which had a somewhat different work force.

The first year results were quite positive. Large numbers of the primary target group of workers participated in, and learned from, the courses. Overall, they increased their bidding rates and received a small but meaningful gain in income of $102. On the average this equaled a net gain of 5.7 per cent in total cannery income for the trainee group in comparison with a matched control group. Although that income gain can be considered an increase in equity through income distribution, the impact of the program was not sufficient to improve materially the employment opportunities for women and minorities.

Although the basic operational results were probably the most important findings, some specific lessons and insights were of almost equal importance. One insight was that worker characteristics varied sufficiently between communities that the program had to have the flexibility to adapt even during the project year to these differences as they emerged. One community, for example, had predominantly older, Black workers, while another had a very high proportion of Mexican-Americans and a third a high proportion of Chinese-Americans. In the latter two communities basic education and English-as-a-second language were obviously important courses, but it was found during the year that the Black workers did not need the basic education.

A related insight which led to the development of a new course was that the Black workers, and indeed all of the others, had a great need to learn about the jobs, the bidding procedures and the other aspects of the cannery internal labor market operations. Just as in the Antioch-Pittsburg project, understanding the details of the specific internal labor markets became a critical first requirement for any other training to be useful. To provide this instruction a new course called Advancement Related Counseling (ARC) was developed and in the middle of the first year was placed in operation in two of the cities.

The Chinese-American workers turned out to be a uniquely resistant cultural group to advancing as a result of the training. They appear to have been drawn heavily to the training by the $2.50 per day expense stipend. They had close group ties which tended to prevent individual members from advancing and had a

unique pattern of using carpools to travel to and from work which served as an inhibition to advancement because a change in job often required a change in work schedule.

Although it produced fairly strong results in the cost-benefit study, basic education came to be seen as a course which could not be related to many of the canneries' jobs and a decision was made not to continue it for the second year.

A final lesson was that even in this program which was undergoing such an active learning and adjustment process, it was possible to develop and maintain a reasonable and useful experimental design evaluation procedure. Maintenance of the design was made possible by continuing coordination and consultation between the training contractor and the evaluation contractor.

The most important development in the second year of the cannery training program was that the companies and the union became the main sources of support. One cent per hour worked by workers in all the canning plants was set aside under the 1973 Collective Bargaining Agreement for the Affirmative Action Cannery Training Program. The Department of Labor did agree to provide about one-half of the cost of supporting the second year of training as a transitional contribution to full industry support.

The second year program made very extensive use of the ARC component. That component was seen, however, as an effort which would reach a saturation point in two or three years as all the workers came to participate heavily in the bidding processes and to understand the jobs which were available. The basic education component was dropped entirely, but English-as-a-second language was continued, although on a reduced scale. Efforts were begun to shift the ESL training to the adult basic education programs in the local school districts. Eventually three districts did develop special programs for cannery workers using the materials developed by the training contractor based on the canning industry language requirements.

Another new course was developed in the second year called Job Proficiency Training. It was developed on the premise that advancement of women would require skill training focused on the highest turnover equipment operator jobs.

A final task in the second year was to begin developing a mechanic training program.

The results of the second year program were more substantial than in the first year. Bidding rates rose even higher and the program had a meaningful impact in helping women advance to higher

paying jobs. Forty-seven per cent of the trainees advanced one pay bracket or more compared to 30 per cent in the first year of the program and 18 per cent of the trainees advanced two or more pay brackets compared to 6 per cent in the first year's program.

Despite the positive results, the efficiency of the Job Proficiency Training program remained too low. The companies and the union saw the skill training program as the core of their affirmative action efforts and desired very high result indicators from that program. The results for that year were that only 57 per cent of the trainees bid for jobs for which they had been trained and only 21 per cent of them gained of these jobs.

The key lesson of the second year was that further improvements were necessary if substantial progress was to be made on achieving the affirmative action goals. One step taken for the third year program was to institute another new course called Machine Familiarization Course. It was developed to introduce thoroughly workers to equipment operator jobs, and to help them make an informed decision about whether to proceed in training. After the three day course the workers were required to bid for the job before they were permitted to continue on with the longer Job Proficiency Training course.

Also in the third year, plans were made to shift from sole reliance on an outside training contractor to primary reliance on individual in-plant trainers drawn from the regular work force.

Over the three year period the training experience demonstrated that lay-off time could be used to help advance women and minority group members. This overall finding led to a decision to make lay-off time training an integral part of the conciliation agreement eventually negotiated between the canning companies, the union and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The conciliation agreement after a period of protracted negotiation and extensive court hearings was finally accepted by the court in June of 1976. For a five year period thereafter there will be a three part lay-off time training program in the canning plants as a way to reach their affirmative action goals for women and minority group members.

There will be equipment operator training, much like the Job Proficiency Training course, directed toward three key high bracket jobs--lift truck operator, label machine operator and oiler-greaser. These jobs were identified as high turnover positions which would offer substantial advancement opportunities and also as key entry points into the higher bracket positions of supervisor, mechanic and equipment operator. Unlike Job Proficiency Training, the new course would qualify fully those who complete the course.

The second component of the long term affirmative action training will be a mechanic training program modeled on the traditional apprenticesehip program. The initial portion of the mechanics training, pre-apprenticeship training, will occur in the lay-off period and will qualify women and minority group men as Bracket III level apprentice mechanics.

The final component of the lay-off time training will be a special craft training program which will make use of local educational institutions.

The training elements in the conciliation agreement will serve to support and facilitate the affirmative action adjustments which are made possible by a revision of the industry seniority plan in the collective bargaining agreement and a requirement that one woman or minority group man be placed in high bracket and mechanic jobs for each Anglo man who is hired.

Conclusions

1. Lay-off time training can be useful, and may even be essential, in industries such as canning which experience extensive seasonal lay-offs. Its applicability to other kinds of lay-offs such as cyclical remains to be tested.

2. Non-skills training will generally lack support by employers in industrial settings because the impact of the training is hard to measure; the benefits accrue to the society as a whole and to the individual participants, and there is no gain to the specific industries.

3. Any training program in an industry needs to be constructed on the basis of a very detailed and precise understanding of the requirements of the individual industry labor market which is the target of the training.

4. Skills training should be built on the basis of very specific employment goals based on a clear understanding of the industry labor market structure and processes. ARC and MFC were examples of pre-skills training courses needed in the cannery industry for this purpose.

Program Impacts

Seven major impacts can be identified from the cannery training program as it evolved from the first year pilot project.

1. The program produced extensive changes in the knowledge and attitudes of the women in the work force about advancement and working. When the program began, only 19 per cent of the trainees even knew about the bidding process as a way of advancing. By the end of the third year, when the Advancement Related Counseling course was discontinued, the job structure and the bidding processes had come to be common knowledge and there was widespread bidding. To be sure, many of the women, especially some of the more senior ones, continue to hold their low bracket jobs and prefer not to advance. Some of this is due to a reluctance to work year round.

   For perspective, it is important to realize that the increased bidding is not a function of the courses alone. Personnel staff in the plants interviewed the women and encouraged them to bid and advance. Many of the plants also altered a variety of their personnel practices to facilitate the advancement of women.

2. The program produced an improvement in the employment status of the women. Our measure is that following the second year of training women received a 35 per cent net increase in their proportion of new regular positions. "Regular" status means that the person worked more than 1400 hours during the year, and the status accords such people enhanced fringe benefits. Since the second year it appears that women are well on the way to achieving the affirmative action targets in many of the high bracket jobs.

   The research also found, however, that there were substantial variations among the plants in terms of bidding and job trial rates at the end of the second year. We expect from that finding that the long term affirmative action adjustment process will progress much more slowly in some plants than in others.*

---

* A special linear regression study was conducted to try to determine whether economic variables such as turnover rates and job growth rates explained a large amount of the variation in training results from plant to plant. The results were not statistically significant. They are reported in Appendix B.

3. The program produced extensive knowledge for the companies and the union about the operation of their internal labor market and about how best to intervene in the market to achieve the affirmative action goals. One of the industry officials interviewed in a final round of interviews with key leaders said:

The entry of the DOL funds had a catalytic effect. The industry learned a lot about the problem and what to do about it. We experimented with various approaches and found those that were most cost effective. The Advancement Related Counseling in particular isolated and clarified problems in the bidding and advancement system.

Another industry official commented:

The pilot project was a good initial learning process to see how to deal with the problems of advancement and upgrading.

In retrospect, this same official said that he would have preferred a better initial analysis of the advancement potential and a plan for training within that potential.

A union official commented:

The industry and the employees had an exposure to training, and what it entailed, and what it offered. The industry realized it could use employees better. The pilot program demonstrated that the need for training which the unions had advocated for many years was there.

4. The program changed the affirmative action conciliation agreement in that it produced a clearer and more substantial role for training in the adjustment process. One of the industry officials said that the initial experiences showed that off-season training was a workable approach and without it they "probably would not have known what could be accomplished."

Another official said:

The pilot project established to the industry's satisfaction that it would be possible to apply the results of off-season training during the season.

A major benefit was that it established off-season training as a viable system and the training program became a fundamental objective of the industry in negotiating the conciliation agreement. If the industry had not had a good experience with the training, it would not have been an industry negotiating objective.

The inclusion of the training program gave the agreement a more futuristic quality in that it was directed toward ameliorating the problem. It is less punitive in nature. Most of the money will be paid through training rather than as compensation. Most settlements are punitive in nature and do not have a remedial program to accomplish the objective of advancing women and minority groups.

5. The program accelerated the affirmative action adjustment process. One industry official said, "The seed money was a substantial stimulus to getting the industry started in solving the problem." Another industry official felt that the conciliation agreement would have included training even if there had not been a pilot project, but he noted that the pilot project allowed the industry to "jump the gun in implementing training. We in effect tried the program before it was ever put into the decree."

6. The program led the industry to develop an internal training capability which it had never had. The model implicit in the pilot project was that an external training contractor would be used. By the end of the second year the industry and union agreed that the plants should develop an internal capability. The external training contractor was then used to select, train and monitor the work of the individual plant trainers.

The role of the external training contractor has always been fraught with tension. The Department of Labor knew from the very beginning that a third party intervention into the industrial collective bargaining arena would be a very sensitive matter. Therefore an orientation session was required at the beginning of the pilot project to acquaint the contractor and its staff with the intricacies of the industrial collective bargaining process.

In spite of a good deal of sensitivity and careful limiting of the contractor's role, there yet remains a sharp division of opinion in both industry and union ranks about whether there ought to be an external contractor. The following are some of the contradictory issues surrounding the role of the training contractor.

a. It is widely believed among both union and industry officials that the Advancement Related Counseling was a function which the union should have been performing long ago. The union had not done so, of course, but nevertheless for the contractor to provide this service meant that it was standing at all times squarely on union turf. No amount of care not to interpret the collective bargaining agreement, not to advocate for the trainees and not to interfere in grievance procedures could eliminate the fundamental structural bind produced by informing workers about the jobs, the pay structure, the working conditions, the bidding processes and the advancement potentials. These are all items defined in the collective bargaining agreement and they are class union "bread and butter issues." The wonder is that the contractor didn't get into a lot more trouble.

b. The union position for many years has been that the companies ought to provide general upgrading training as a matter of employee right under the collective bargaining agreement. The union knows the employers have little interest in anything but the most cost-effective training. They also know that preserving the seniority principle requires that the most senior women and minority group men receive basic education and English-as-a-second language training. Both groups also need a good deal of counseling and encouragement in order to take advantage of the advancement opportunities. Many in the union saw the training contractor as a neutral party whose behavior they could share in controlling and thereby be more assured that the principles of seniority and training as a negotiated benefit would be protected from the companies' drive for cost-effectiveness and their indifference to the seniority principle. The contractor therefore had the difficult role of monitor and almost mediator between the two powerful parties.

269-748 O - 78 - 8

An interesting related point is that one of the union officials in the final interviews said that the evaluation requirements attached to the Department of Labor funds were important benefits of participation in the pilot project since evaluation tended to "keep everyone honest."

c. The canning industry had almost no history of organized training before the pilot project, and it is the opinion of many that the training could not have been developed on a uniform industry-wide basis without an outside training contractor. But there are those who disagree, including one of the company officials interviewed in the last round. He thought that the training could have been done all along by the plants themselves under some uniform guidelines.

In part, the sharp differences of opinion about the need for an outside contractor stem from the fact that the industry is not uniform in its structure. There are five large companies, some multi-national and a large number of small companies, many of which are local in nature. The variation among the companies in size and composition tends to produce quite different industrial relations and personnel practices. For example, one of the large companies almost immediately recruited the training contractor to help develop supervisory training using the company's own funds. That company also quickly began to develop its own internal training capability because it wanted to do more Job Proficiency Training than could be supported out of its share of the joint project. Few other companies followed these leads.

The complexity from the industry side is matched from the union side; there are 13 union locals among the 76 Northern California canning plants. Each local has somewhat unique organizational and political characteristics, thereby posing varied problems of diplomacy for the contractor from community to community.

7. <u>The program served as a catalyst to gain development of public school adult education, (ESL), services for the cannery workers.</u> By the end of the first year the

companies and the union agreed that the main ESL effort should be shifted to the public schools. In response to this decision the contractor made its special cannery related ESL text available to the public schools. The contractor also ran workshops for approximately 50 teachers from three different school systems to train them to use the industrial language skill teaching method. Three districts instituted ESL training for cannery workers.

Analysis: The Role of Training in Affirmative Action Adjustments

The cannery training program successfully demonstrated that seasonal lay-off time could be used effectively for training. It also had substantial impact on the final conciliation agreement between EEOC and the canning companies and union. But a nagging question remains: What role in the affirmative action adjustment process does training play in relationship to other variables? Stated differently, if one wants to improve employment opportunities for women and minority group men in an internal labor market setting, what are the range of things which need to be done and to what degree can one rely on training as a solution? The cannery project doesn't clearly answer these questions, but it does offer a basis for some useful, informed speculation. The first step is to identify the constraining factors encountered in the project which limit the rate of advancement. These were:

1. Constraints in the collective bargaining agreement;

2. Informal hiring and advancement practices by supervisors and negative supervisory attitudes and expectations;

3. Lack of information about the collective bargaining agreement and the hiring and advancement procedures;

4. Cultural norms and attitudes against the advancement of women held by the women themselves;

5. Financial disincentives to advancement posed by the loss of Unemployment Insurance benefits;

6. Economic limitations on job opportunities such as a low rate of growth in jobs or low turnover rates; and

7. Lack of required job skills by the women and minority men.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement Constraints

The collective bargaining agreement can be an absolute barrier to adjustment. When the canning industry had two entirely separate clusters of jobs, one labeled men's and the other women's, no adjustment on behalf of women was possible at all. Adjustment became possible when the job categories were integrated, but four other aspects of the collective bargaining agreement stood as substantial barriers to the advancement of women:

1. The classification of workers into "regulars" and "seasonals" with regular status attaching permanently after one first worked 1400 hours in a given year;

2. The incumbency rule which, although not technically part of the agreement, gave all workers return rights to their prior seasons' jobs regardless of their relative seniority;

3. Open entry into any of the high bracket jobs; and

4. The requirement that workers be qualified for the jobs.

Informal Hiring Practices

For most of the history of the canneries, hiring and advancement were informal processes decided by line supervisors. The bidding system first was instituted in 1970 but many informal practices persisted thereafter. Many supervisors did not want women workers and the existence of informal hiring channels gave them an opportunity to limit hiring and advancement.

Lack of Information

The trainees had an intense desire to learn many basic facts about plant jobs and governing rules. The lack of information was clearly a major impediment.

Restrictive Cultural Norms

There were strongly held judgments about the limited role of women especially among the Mexican-American and Chinese-American women. These attitudes were strongly held, and for many of the older women, very resistant to change.

Financial Disincentives

The Unemployment Insurance system was a great attraction to many of the women encouraging them not to seek year round work. Moving to a slightly better job carried with it a substantial tax cost in the form of lost Unemployment Insurance.

Economic Conditions

In the section of Chapter III called Analysis of Variations Between Plants in Job Trial Rates we reported that an analysis of economic factors, such as turnover rates and the growth in jobs, did not explain a significant proportion of the variation in bidding or job trial rates. Although not statistically significant because of the small sample size, the suggestion was that these factors accounted for about 30 per cent of the variation in job trial rates. It is useful to assume that this is a reasonable estimate as it suggests that the economic conditions are important, but they leave a great portion (70 per cent) of the variation unexplained.

Lack of Skills

We list this factor last because initially it was not the major issue--lack of information and restrictive attitudes were much more important at the beginning. Skill training gradually emerged as a key issue as the other factors were eliminated and it will become a major obstacle as women approach the high bracket and mechanic jobs.

What role then does training play in solving the problem? In our judgment there are three categories of action which can be taken and we rank them in the following order of importance in making the affirmative action adjustment.

1. Change the collective bargaining agreement;
2. Implement an affirmative policy down to the line supervisor level; and
3. Provide training directed to information, attitudes and job skills.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement

The 1973 Collective Bargaining Agreement made a step forward in opening opportunities when it merged the regular and seasonal seniority lists, although it had a grandfather clause protecting those who had already made regular, no matter how little total seniority they had. The 1973 agreement also began to limit the entry possibilities into high bracket jobs from outside the work force.

The conciliation agreement struck at the heart of the collective bargaining agreement by instituting the concept of "plant seniority," thus eliminating the grandfather clause. It also expressly forbade use of the incumbency rule if there was a qualified person with higher seniority available in the work force. It established a four step search process which must be followed before a person, other than a woman or minority, can be hired from the outside for a high bracket or mechanic job. Finally, it established that women and minority group men who complete the training are fully qualified and can directly claim a job for which they have the requisite plant seniority, regardless of whether there is a vacancy in the position. As a general rule, the conciliation agreement has prior status in all matters over the collective bargaining agreement.

Affirmative Action Policy

With any flexibility in the collective bargaining agreement, much can be done if a plant or company desires to do it. Folk wisdom states the proposition as, "If there's a will, there's a way."

We were reminded when considering the policy variable of the response we got in one of the early plant personnel officer interviews. We started the interview by asking about manpower and affirmative action problems. The personnel officer said that he did not feel that his plant had very serious problems and he pulled out a set of pictures of women performing most of the jobs currently getting attention under the conciliation agreement.

He said a year or more earlier all of the plant supervisors had been called in and told by the plant manager that it was now part of their jobs to find and train women for all of the jobs. There was a mild protest from the all male supervisors in the form of a red light being stuck over the personnel officer's door, with the sign "Frank's Cat House," but he and the plant manager made the policy stick and the affirmative action adjustment was proceeding apace. When we asked him about the training program, he said that it was "just fine," and he encouraged all of the plant's

workers to participate, but he wasn't going to wait for it to solve his problem.

The companies which pursued supervisory training have also tended to expedite implementation. An item in the training contractor's 1976-77 planning document illustrated a small set of other actions which serve to differentiate between companies which are actively pursuing an affirmative action policy compared with those which are not. It was noted that in 1974 some plants suspended the incumbency rule for all Bracket IV jobs, while others didn't. Some plants allowed a person to take a job trial for a higher paying job with the guarantee that they could return to their old job and work shift while others didn't. Some plants arranged their own plant tours while others didn't.

In summary, our judgment is that the policy variable is very powerful in determining the rate of affirmative action. It translates into a series of actions which are feasible within the constraints provided by the collective bargaining agreement. Our judgment is that a great deal of the variation in bidding and job trial rates reported in Chapter III can be found in the differences between the plants in the degree to which each implemented a clear affirmative action policy.

Training

Judge Orrick in his opinion approving the conciliation agreement said the training would be used to "facilitate women and minority advancement in high bracket jobs." Our sense is that the statement places training in reasonable perspective. If the other conditions are favorable, then training can have a powerful impact on advancement. It may turn out that for some jobs, and especially for the more senior women, training may be an essential activity. One of the industry officials we interviewed said that several other industries were having difficulty implementing affirmative action goals in the mechanic jobs. That may well become the occupation where training and its limits will be given the greatest test.

Policy Implications

The most obvious question raised by the project is: Should it be public policy to support the development of training programs in affirmative action settlements? The subsidiary questions are: To what degree and under what conditions should EEOC accept training programs as important, integral parts of affirmative action settlements? To what degree and under what conditions should the federal government provide seed money to help firms start the process of implementing affirmative action plans which

require training, or which would be materially improved if training were available?

The cannery lay-off time training program demonstrated that the federal government could serve as a catalyst to develop a training capability. It also demonstrated that much had to be learned about the operation of the cannery internal labor market before the right interventions by the industry itself could achieve the affirmative action goals.

Answering the policy questions requires that we consider what would have happened in the ultimate affirmative action adjustment if there had been no intervention by the Department of Labor in the form of the offer of pilot project funds. We think that the EEOC settlement and its implementation would have unfolded about as follows:

1. There probably would have been some form of organized training for mechanics, although there was much opposition to training of almost any kind. The industry and union would have argued that their prior on-the-job training program in the collective bargaining agreement had not been satisfactory even without complicating the problem by injecting the requirement that women be advanced to 20 per cent of these positions.

2. The industry and union would have believed that some form of training was needed to help women advance to the high bracket jobs, but they would have been greatly handicapped in making a coherent argument. There would probably not have been training provisions in the conciliation agreement for high bracket equipment operator jobs in light of the intervenors objections. Each company and plant would have had to take its own steps to implement the affirmative action goals.

3. No provision would have been made for a training program like the Advancement Related Counseling, although there would be requirements that information and counseling be provided to help the women take advantage of the advancement opportunities. Many people would have realized that the affirmative action changes implied great change in the attitudes the women have about their work roles and the knowledge they have about the industry labor market, but these realizations would have been based on vague awarenesses. Unless there was data available from other industries' experiences, it would have

been hard to articulate and specify the need. The information and counseling would have been implemented on a plant by plant basis without a uniform industry-wide program and in an uneven and confused way

The predictable consequences would have been that the industry as a whole would have proceeded to implement a mechanic skills training program, possibly retaining a training consultant to help in the program design. There would be two or three years of trial and error learning, much as there is liable to be in this part of the program even now. Each plant or company would have acted on its own to train for high bracket jobs and they would also have sought individually to cope with the women's general lack of knowledge about the cannery labor market and their inhibitions about advancing.

The experience with the cannery training project suggests the following hypotheses about the final affirmative action results:

1. Results would have been gained much more slowly. The plants and the companies, largely on an individual basis, would have run into the barriers posed by the women's prior limited experience. They would have had to sort through these problems, developing small courses or presentations, and activities of their own to compensate for these problems.

2. There would have been wider disparities in the rate of progress from plant to plant and company to company. Even with an industry-wide training program there were substantial variations from plant to plant and these would likely be even more exaggerated.

3. The total affirmative action impact would be lower. This total effect would derive from the first two results.

The public policy questions then end up asking: Will the total benefit to society as a whole and to minorities and women, or to other discriminated parties, be sufficiently greater to justify the cost for the government to play on a broader scale the catalyst role it played in the canning industry. Would it pay for the government to provide seed money to industries to help them develop a precise understanding of the adjustment problems and strategies needed in their labor markets, and to stimulate development of training where it appears to be an

appropriate strategy? The cannery experience was one clear case of government action in this catalyst role producing quite substantial additional benefits. Quite possibly many more such opportunities could be found if EEOC as a matter of practice investigated training as a possible tool to use with others in an approach designed to stop discrimination and get a rapid reversal in its past effects on the job status of present employees.

APPENDIX A

METHODOLOGY FOR INCOME ANALYSIS OF FIRST YEAR TRAINEES

1. Sampling Procedure

A sampling procedure was designed that selected 200 individuals from the 292 trainees who completed the JAT III program. Those dropping out of the program prior to completion, numbering 116, were excluded from this analysis.

The sample was designed to be proportionate to the percentage distribution of the total training population, that completed training, among the three LOTT components--English-as-a-Second Language (ESL), Basic Education (BE), and Advancement Related Counseling (ARC). This percentage distribution was as follows: 33% in ESL, 22% in BE and 45% in ARC. The sample, therefore, was comprised of 66 trainees from ESL, 44 from BE and 90 from ARC. In selecting this sample, the sex and race of participants in the program was taken into account for each training component. Following is a table showing the actual distribution for the total training population and the corresponding one for the sample.

2. Selection of Control Group for Income Analysis

During September, candidates for the control group were selected using plant seniority lists to match each member of the experimental group with a cannery worker who had not enrolled in the program. The selection criteria consisted of matching by sex, ethnicity, cannery plant employer, and seniority level, and for Spanish or Chinese surnamed control group candidates, facility with the English language. Faced with a short deadline for obtaining the pre-training earnings data from the California Unemployment Compensation records we did not attempt to screen the Chinese or Spanish surnamed for English fluency, but rather selected three possible control members for each experimental group member with a Spanish or Chinese surname. This afforded the Center with income data on all possible matches and also allowed for later identification of English facility through telephone interviews.

3. Collection of Income Data on Experimental and Control Groups

Income for the four quarters of 1972 was obtained for all members of the experimental and control groups. Earnings by employer are annotated on the wage and claim abstract which permitted separating cannery income from all other sources of income. The income data was obtained from the Employment Data and Research division of the California State Employment Development Department via completion of an information request card for each member of the experimental and control groups.

Trainee Group Sample for Income Analysis*

	JAT Population			JAT Sample			Percentage Distribution		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
ESL Mex Am	13	56	69	9	39	48	13%	58%	71%
Chin Am		26	26		18	18		27%	27%
Other		2	2		0	0		2%	2%
Total	13	84	97	9	57	66	13%	87%	100%
BE Mex Am	3	33	36	2	23	25	5%	52%	57%
Chin Am	0	5	5	0	4	4		8%	8%
Other	4	18	22	2	13	15	6%	29%	35%
Total	7	56	63	4	40	44	11%	89%	100%
ARC Mex Am		22	22		15	15		17%	17%
Other	3	107	110	2	73	75	2%	81%	83%
Total	3	129	132	2	88	90	2%	98%	100%
TOTAL Mex Am	16	111	127	11	77	88	5%	38%	43%
Chin Am	0	32	32	0	22	22		11%	11%
Other	7	126	133	4	86	90	3%	43%	46%
Total	23	269	292	15	185	200	8%	92%	100%

*Additional candidates for the sample categories (training components by sex and race) were drawn to accommodate any future contingencies arising from departure from industry and therefore no cannery income during the evaluation period.

APPENDIX B

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIATIONS IN BIDDING AND JOB TRIAL RATES

Definitions of Variables

Dependent Variables

1. % JPT Trainees Who Bid and Got Job Trial = $\frac{\text{JPT Trainees Having Job Trial}}{\text{JPT Trainees Who Bid}}$

2. % ESL-ARC Trainees Who Bid and Got Job Trial = $\frac{\text{ESL-ARC Trainees Having Job Trial}}{\text{ESL-ARC Trainees Who Bid}}$

3. % Total Trainees (ESL-ARC-JPT) Who Bid and Got Job Trial = $\frac{\text{Total Trainees Having Job Trial}}{\text{Total Trainees Who Bid}}$

4. % JPT Who Passed Job Trial = $\frac{\text{JPT Trainees Passing Job Trials}}{\text{Total JPT Trainees}}$

5. % ESL-ARC Trainees Who Passed Job Trial = $\frac{\text{ESL-ARC Trainees Passing Job Trial}}{\text{Total ESL-ARC Trainees}}$

6. % Total Trainees Who Passed Job Trial = $\frac{\text{Total Trainees Passing Job Trials}}{\text{Total Trainees}}$

Independent Variables

1. Turnover Between '74-'75 Among Top 25% of Seniority List (%) = $\frac{\text{Place of last person in top 25\% on 1974 seniority list minus place of same person on 1975 list}}{\text{No. in top 25\% in 1974}}$

2. Same as (1) above for Top 50% of Seniority List.

3. Same as (1) above for Top 75% of Seniority List.

4. Net Growth or Decline in the Work Force (%) = $\frac{\text{No. in 1975-No. in 1974}}{\text{No. in 1974}}$

5. Turnover Between '74-'75 Among Regulars (%) = $\frac{\text{No. of '74 Regulars-(No. of '75 Regulars-New Regulars)}}{\text{No. of 1974 Regulars}}$

6. Net Growth or Decline in Regulars (%) = $\frac{\text{No. of '75 Regulars-No. of '74 Regulars}}{\text{No. of 1974 Regulars}}$

7. Turnover Between '74-75 Among Seasonals in First Quartile of Seniority List (%) = No. Seniority Positions Last Person in Quartile Advanced Between '74-'75 / No. of Seasonals in Top 25% in 1974

8. Same as (7) above for Seasonals in Second Quartile of Seniority List.

9. Same as (7) above for Seasonals in Third Quartile.

10. Relative Seniority of JPT Trainees = Average Seniority of Trainees / Average Seniority of Seasonals with 3 of More Years of Seniority

11. Same Calculation of Relative Seniority as (10) above for ESL-ARC Trainees.

12. Same Calculation of Relative Seniority as (10) above for Total Trainees.

13. Proportion of New Regulars Who Are Male (%) = New Male Regulars / New Regulars

14. Perceived Company Attitude Toward Bidding = Average of Scalar Measures from 1 (high) to 4 (low) assigned by JPT trainees during interview

Table of Regression Results

Dependent Variable	Mean of Dependent Variable	Maximum Multiple Correlation Coefficient*	Maximum Coefficient of Determination	F Value (none significant at .10)	Standard Error of Estimate*
		r	r^2	F	
1. % JPT Bid and Job Trial	49.7%	.485	.235	1.733	25.3
2. % ESL-ARC Bid and Job Trial	52.2%	.555	.308	2.568	29.2
3. % Total Bid and Job Trial	53.7%	.268	.072	1.002	18.2
4. % JPT Who Passed Job Trial	35.0%	.553	.306	2.402	22.1
5. % ESL-ARC Trainees Who Passed Job Trial	30.1%	.510	.260	2.600	19.1
6. % Total Trainees Who Passed Job Trial	34.7%	.458	.210	2.121	15.6

*Adjusted for degrees of freedom.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1978 O - 269-743

Where to Get More Information

For more information on this and other programs of research and development funded by the Employment and Training Administration, contact the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C. 20213, or any of the Regional Administrators for Employment and Training whose addresses are listed below.

Location	States Served	
John F. Kennedy Bldg. Boston, Mass. 02203	Connecticut Maine Massachusetts	New Hampshire Rhode Island Vermont
1515 Broadway New York, N.Y. 10036	New Jersey New York Canal Zone	Puerto Rico Virgin Islands
P.O. Box 8796 Philadelphia, Pa. 19101	Delaware Maryland Pennsylvania	Virginia West Virginia District of Columbia
1371 Peachtree Street, NE. Atlanta, Ga. 30309	Alabama Florida Georgia Kentucky	Mississippi North Carolina South Carolina Tennessee
230 South Dearborn Street Chicago, Ill. 60604	Illinois Indiana Michigan	Minnesota Ohio Wisconsin
911 Walnut Street Kansas City, Mo. 64106	Iowa Kansas	Missouri Nebraska
Griffin Square Bldg. Dallas, Tex. 75202	Arkansas Louisiana New Mexico	Oklahoma Texas
1961 Stout Street Denver, Colo. 80294	Colorado Montana North Dakota	South Dakota Utah Wyoming
450 Golden Gate Avenue San Francisco, Calif. 94102	Arizona California Hawaii Nevada	American Samoa Guam Trust Territory
909 First Avenue Seattle, Wash. 98174	Alaska Idaho	Oregon Washington